THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11. FEBRUARY 1932. Vol. XXI.

IN MEMORIAM

CHARLES GORE

BY the death of Bishop Gore the Anglican Communion has lost a great personality. In his daily life he was strenuous, devout and self-denying. Possessed of great practical ability, acute mental powers, and far-reaching social influence, he was one of the great Victorians. Few men during the last fifty years have done more than he to mould the character and policy of the Church of England. One English diocese looks to him as its founder, two important ecclesiastical institutions, Pusey House and the Community of the Resurrection, revere his memory as one who at the outset had the steerage of their course and handled the helm with conspicuous ability.

When the sun of Charles Gore rose above the ecclesiastical horizon the Oxford Movement had already accomplished the first stage of its advance under the leadership of John Keble, Dr. Pusey, Canon Liddon, and those abler leaders who had deserted it for the inviting shade of the *limina apostolorum* of the Church of Rome.

The child of Romanicism and the Medieval Scholastic Theology begotten in response to the spirit of revolt against liberalism in Church and State, the Oxford Movement had advanced as far as it was possible for it to get on the lines on which it had started. It had fled from the dull, commonplace, unheroic contemporary Church-life which it loathed.

But what was its future course to be?

The Christian Year, Hymns Ancient and Modern, Tracts for the Times, Pusey's Commentaries, Liddon's Sermons, the Theological Colleges of Cuddesdon and Wells, the new episcopal ideal presented by Samuel Wilberforce, shew us the Oxford Movement as Charles Gore first experienced it. It had a policy strictly circumscribed. It might restore churches, found Anglican brotherhoods and sisterhoods, catholicize parishes, extend its foreign missions, build up Colonial Churches, but except in these directions the power of progress was denied it. It despised the Evangelicals, it feared the Liberals, it dared not embrace the Romanists.

It was Charles Gore and the *Lux Mundi* group whom he led who found the way to fresh advances. With immense courage Gore accepted the results of Biblical Criticism. He dared to acknowledge not only that the Old Testament science and history was inaccurate. He even dared to affirm that modern critics of the Old Testament knew more about the facts of its composition than did the Saviour Himself; in short, that our Lord's human consciousness experienced and exhibited the limits of His terrestrial environment. *Essays and Reviews* was a brave and epoch-making book, but *Lux Mundi* was no less so. It gave the Anglo-Catholics a deserved ascendancy over their Evangelical rivals who still clung to Biblical infallibility and shuddered at Gore's doctrine of the *Kenosis*.

The other line of advance which Gore led was along the path of Christian Socialism. As in the field of Biblical Criticism so in that of Christian Socialism, the first to lead the way were the English Broad Churchmen. Colenso and Jowett did much in the former field; F. D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley in the latter. But under the inspired leadership of Charles Gore, the Anglo-Catholics began to play a notable part with the thunder they had borrowed from the Liberals. Up to the ascendancy of Charles Gore and his friends the English clergy had been predominantly Conservative in politics, with a small admixture of Whigs and Gladstonian Liberals. Gore himself and the Community of the Resurrection became an important factor in the creation of Anglican clerical Socialism. As a consequence the Church of England ceased to be one of the great strongholds of

the Conservative party. She who had been aptly described as the Conservative party at prayer, became, as the result of Gore's influence, at least in the persons of her Anglo-Catholic clergy, the Socialist party at Mass.

The Bishop lived in an age of rapid transition, and he did his best to assist the Church of England to adjust herself to her new environment. Those who, like ourselves, are convinced that the English people are not lovers of a sacerdotalist, sacramentalist, dogmatic, disciplinary type of Christianity, doubt whether the ascendancy which Anglo-Catholicism achieved under his leadership can possibly be permanent. His influence in rendering the Church of England sympathetic to social reform will have a more enduring character. As a religious teacher, he was perhaps greatest as a commentator. His expositions of the Sermon on the Mount, and the Epistles to the Ephesians and Romans, are masterpieces of sincere, attractive, and illuminating instruction. As a Church disciplinarian he was severe but just. In his support of Church work he was munificent in his generosity.

As an English modernist theologian he deserves to rank with Maurice, Jowett, Westcott, Hort and Rashdall. He would not have felt quite happy in the company of some of them because they were more devoted to truth and less to orthodoxy than he. Nevertheless he accomplished what they could not have done—he liberalized the Oxford Movement. It was his hard lot to espouse causes which, had he followed them through, would have taken him much farther than he was willing to go. This gave him the air, and created in the ranks of his followers the uncomfortable feeling, that he was a Lost Leader. He was not that. He was a brave, cautious, conscientious and capable leader, but called on to face a series of very difficult situations in which even a practical genius of the quality of Mandell Creighton could not always have triumphed.

H.D.A.M.

ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS

THE Head of an Oxford College said recently, 'I love the English parson, but I loathe the Anglican priest.' Arthur Charles Jennings belonged to the class of the beloved. He was what would be described to-day as 'an old-time English country parson.' A man of great physical strength, virile manners, shrewd intelligence, kind heart, and withal 'a scholar and a gentleman.' Educated at Eton and Jesus College, Cambridge, he took a first-class in the Theological Tripos and captured all the theological prizes. He had a very sound knowledge of Hebrew and of Septuagintal Greek, and used it to produce an excellent commentary on the Psalms. He also published several volumes of Church History, useful for general readers but not distinguished by original research. He spent forty years of ministerial life as parson of two country parishes, Whittlesford (1877—1886) and King's Stanley (1886—1916). His broad human sympathies made him an ecclesiastical Liberal, his theological studies made him a Modernist. He was one of the oldest members of the Modern Churchmen's Union and attended the annual conferences, especially when held in Cambridge. His humour was antique; he referred to his curates, not as his colleagues, but as his accomplices. He told with gusto the following story:

> He asked an old man who showed him round a church whether he was the clerk. 'I used to be,' replied the old man, 'when I was first here, but the new parson said I was a "sextant"; but the one that followed him, he put me in a gown and called me his "virgin," and the new Vicar dresses me in a cassock and surplice and says I am "the Servant," so I don't know what I be, but I used to be "the clerk," and I would like to drink your honour's health.'

Mr. Jennings was kind and understanding in his treatment of poor and humble people, and was liked by them. He had a delightful helpmate in Georgiana, the daughter of Colonel Wale.

On resigning, Mr. Jennings retired to Bath, whose intellectual life was directed by Frederick Harrison, and became a member of the Society known as 'The Socratics,' over whose deliberations the great man at times presided.

He was no admirer of stunts and novelties or cant and caution —a very kindly, honest, unambitious worker in the Vineyard.

Winthrop Mackworth Praed concludes some memorial verses on a delightful vicar of the old school with the line :

Vir nulla est donandus lauru. (There can be no promotion for such.)

Men of this kind are not destined for high places in the Church; they fit far too well the country parishes in which they live and labour for any to wish to move them; they do not yearn for intellectual society, for they not only possess a good library and know how to use it, but they find their rural neighbours neither lacking in intelligence nor interest; they do not complain of poverty because they are not entirely dependent on the revenues of their parish. They are the men whose sons have built up the British Empire, but they themselves are becoming an extinct race. Why?

It is too profound a question to answer here. *Sunt lacrimae rerum.*

H.D.A.M.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The New Basis of Intercommunion.

It is a matter of sincere congratulation that the English Convocations have ratified the terms of inter-communion between the Old Catholics and ourselves. Congratulation is not primarily due to the cementing of inter-communion between the English Church and a continental body of Christians which claims the title Catholic and is possessed of undoubted Apostolic Succession. Our English Catholicity needs no support of this kind against Roman Catholicism. What is a matter of supreme congratulation is that the negotiations with the Old Catholics have led to the conception of an entirely new and right basis for inter-communion between separated Christian bodies. Hitherto it has been held in ecclesiastical circles that in order to secure inter-communion there must be agreement between the two bodies in their doctrines, in their church order, and in their liturgical worship. Happily that basis for inter-communion has been abandoned. All that is required is that each body should regard the other as sufficiently Christian to make inter-communion with it desirable. With admirable brevity and clarity these conditions have thus been formulated and agreed upon :

1. Each Communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other, and maintains its own.

2. Each Communion agrees to admit members of the other Communion to participate in the Sacraments.

3. Inter-communion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith.

This document constitutes a model for future negotiations. Our common Christian Faith and Life is the real basis for our inter-communion as Christians, not the superficial basis of agreement about a vast number of minor issues, many of them of an extremely technical and unpractical character.

The right *modus operandi* having been at last discovered and agreed upon, we may look to great achievements in the sphere of inter-communion in the near future.

Our Bishops and Home Reunion.

There have been occasions when our English prelates have voiced the profoundest convictions of the nation. It was so in the days of *Magna Carta*, and also when seven of their lordships went to the Tower in the reign of James II. Not less profound, though less dramatic, has been the strong support which their action in Convocation for securing inter-communion with English Free Churchmen has called forth.

The Bishops proposed to regard the Rubric which requires that before any are admitted to the Holy Communion they should be confirmed, or ready and willing to be confirmed, as properly and strictly applicable only to those who have been baptized with the Church of England Prayer Book Service, and not to those baptized English Christians who have not been so baptized.

The *Times* in a leading article of the 20th January, entitled 'Charity and Common Sense,' warmly welcomed these long overdue proposals. The English Church Union and many clergy in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury opposed them. The *Times* of the 23rd January published a very weighty letter by the Bishop of Chelmsford shewing that the Confirmation Rubric had never been rigorously enforced, and not least in that most intolerant age in our English Church life,

the seventeenth century. He summarized the historical case as follows :

> 'The facts are that so far from Confirmation being regarded as an essential preliminary to Communion for Nonconformists, not one in a hundred even of the Church folk was confirmed in those days!'

After citing a number of striking statements in support, the Bishop concluded with these words :

> 'Evidence of this kind abounds and is clear proof that the verdict of Bishop Creighton and Bishop Stubbs is true. The Confirmation Rubric was the Church's rule of discipline for its own children and was not designed to exclude from the Sacrament in our Church members of other religious communions.'

The conflict, however, is not one that can be settled by an appeal to historical evidence, nor to the pressing need for more cordial relations with our Free Churchmen. If the Bishops admit to the Holy Communion, as we believe they are resolved to do, English Free Churchmen without requiring them to be confirmed, a number of Anglo-Catholics will secede to the Church of Rome. The Bishops naturally desire to avoid such a calamitous secession, especially if it be headed by the venerable Lord Halifax. 'Why,' it is asked, 'should the Bishops split the Church of England in order to unite with Nonconformists?' That question would have seemed a formidable one before the War, or even before the Lambeth Conference of 1920 : it is too late to ask it now. The tide of inter-communion is coming in apace and the old ecclesiastical landmarks are being rapidly submerged. What however is perhaps the most gratifying aspect of this latest phase of the reunion movement is that the Bishops, unlike the famous Duke of Plaza-Toro, are not on this occasion leading from behind.

An American Estimate of an Indian Prophet.

Aristotle defined man as 'a political animal,' and in these days when politics provides more halfpence and fewer kicks for its votaries than was formerly the case, our ecclesiatical neighbours seem to be more political than they used to be, although they have not yet produced that monstrosity, an ecclesiastical press-baron. Sorely, like Elihu and the Psalmist, have we been tempted to speak, and to enter, with our contemporaries, the attractive borderland of Geneva, where politics, piety, and plati-

tude embrace. We have nevertheless kept silence, possibly even from good words, because for us as soon as a personage or a policy became political, he, she, or it became *tabu*. We need hardly add that, tempted as we are by slithery sentimentalists and fallacious futilities, we have no intention of departing from our rule. We think, however, that the following extract from the sermon of an eminent American Modernist, the Rector of St. John's Church, Washington, may interest our readers:

> First: 'Parliaments are emblems of slavery. That which you consider to be the Mother of Parliaments is like a sterile woman and a prostitute.'
>
> Second: 'Post offices enable anyone to abuse his fellows by means of a letter for one penny.'
>
> Third: 'Medical science is the concentrated essence of black magic; hospitals are the instruments that the Devil has been using for his own purposes and perpetuate vice, misery, degradation and slavery.'
>
> Fourth: 'The profession of pleaders (barristers) is as degrading as prostitution.'
>
> Fifth: 'Railways have become a distributing agency for the Evil One only.'
>
> Are these the words of a Stalin of Russia? They are the words of Ghandi, in many aspects Christian, in many ways great, in every respect unselfish; but surely unbalanced and hardly sane. Abolish all these 'evils,' and millions of his countrymen would die in misery, in pain, and in want. Yet many of us are inclined, and I confess to be one, to regard him as the great spiritual force in the world to-day. It is an illustration of the devastation that can be wrought in the soul when Reason, God's great pruning knife and guardian of thought, is set aside.*

**The Little Messenger of St. John's*, Nov. 29, 1931.

BODY, MIND, AND BRIDLE

AN INTEGRATED EDUCATION

By Sir MICHAEL SADLER, Master of University College, Oxford.

[The following remarks were made by Sir Michael Sadler at the end of a discussion at the annual meeting of the Dalcroze Society, held at University College, London, on January 6th, 1932. The preceding speakers were Sir Henry Hadow, who was in the chair, Mr. Geoffrey Whitworth (Drama League), Miss Potter (Caldecott Community) and Miss Swann.]

WE have learnt a great deal from the four speakers this morning. On the place of music in education, no living man speaks with greater authority than Sir Henry Hadow: Mr. Geoffrey Whitworth has shown us the need for Eurhythmics in Drama: Miss Potter has told us of the great work which the Caldecott Community is doing in the training of children: Miss Swann has thrilled us by dwelling on the importance of Dalcroze Eurhythmics in modern education and what a part it may play in the development of the post-war child.

I am glad that Sir Henry Hadow talked about Plato. I understand that many young people who are studying Economics and Social Science in London are drawn towards Communism. In the course of their study they are sure to have their attention drawn to the works of Plato. Plato was a Communist. Perhaps they will wonder why it is that, though Plato's doctrine has been widely studied in all parts of the world for many centuries, and though he was one of the greatest people who ever lived, nevertheless his doctrine of communism has never yet been successfully put into practice. The fundamental thing in Plato's doctrine was education. He saw that the first thing to do is to decide what kind of social life you would like men to lead if you can manage to persuade or to force them to follow it. He wanted them to be Communists. Therefore, his education has a Communist colour. But whether we agree or not with him about Communism, we can go whole-heartedly with him in believing that education is one of the strongest instruments for bringing about and maintaining the kind of society which we think would be good for ourselves and for our fellow-citizens.

This is a revolutionary period. In earlier revolutionary periods, the minds of many men and women have hankered after the Greeks. This was the case in the Renaissance. It was the case too in the great revolutionary period in Europe at the end of the eighteenth century. Prussia, as usual, got a chance of trying its hand at the problem. In the early part of the nineteenth century, Goethe, Schiller and Wilhelm von Humboldt effected a great reform in Prussian higher secondary education. They called their new secondary schools by the Greek name 'gymnasium,' which refers to the training of the body. Yet, strange to relate, they omitted anything connected with the body, though the rhythmic training of the body was fundamental in the best Greek education. These German savants were keen to copy Greek education and clean forgot to give physical training its proper place!

But why was it that the most artistic kind of Greek education as a whole was a failure? This is one of the most crucial questions in history. Greek education is a lovely thing to think about. Giorgione's picture, the *Fête Champêtre*, is not more lovely than one's dreams of what it must have been like to have a liberal education in Athens. Even the crabbed style of Aristotle cannot hide its beauty. Why is it then that this lovely thing has not survived? *The answer is that it became corroded by lust.* It is right to think a great deal about the body. The physical side of us is of fundamental importance in human life. But we need a bridle. The bridle must be ethical principle sternly enforced by ourselves upon ourselves. Personally, I believe that this bridle can only be effective when our ethical standard is rooted in sincere religious belief.

Another matter which is weighing more and more heavily on my mind is this: what will be the character of English national education in the future? Let us never forget to remind ourselves how much we have to be thankful for in recent developments of English education and for all the care and treasure which have been lavished upon English schools during living memory. More has been done in England during the last thirty years for the advancement of education in this country than has been done in any other thirty years in our history. Nevertheless, I am anxious about the future. Mercifully, in our English schools, a

good deal of time is given to games. Mercifully, the English tradition (which is really a mediaeval tradition) of community life and individual responsibility is still a potent force in our schools. In varying degrees, spiritual discipline and religious belief still have their place. Some people say they are weaker than they were. I doubt it. There is less make-believe. Things have taken a new form. But, on the whole, I think they are as strong as they ever were.

I was very much interested by Sir Henry Hadow's allusion to Chaucer's Squyer. I must admit that not every squire I have met was quite like Chaucer's picture. But the best of them care for the countryside, have a friendly word for people in their village, know the points of a horse, and, when you go out for a walk with them, see and hear birds that we townspeople do not notice. Now the interesting thing about England is that the English squire, who at fifty years of age is apt to be a little sleepy after dinner and is mainly interested—apart from hunting and his work on the Bench—in shooting and cattle and horses and crops, went to school with a lot of boys who are now barristers or civil servants or clergymen or writers of books or of articles in newspapers. These different types of Englishmen had to live together and to work together at school. Each gave the other something which he would otherwise have missed. When I meet a squire now who was at school with me, he makes quite pleasant references to the time when we were at school together. But probably, at the back of his mind, he remembers quite well that he didn't think much of me at the time. For private reasons, I had to be what is called a 'swot' and he was one of the people now called a 'blood' and what we used to call a 'swell.' The great point about English secondary education is that the 'blood' and the 'swot' are educated together. In the Middle Ages they were not. If you were a 'blood,' you went to a great man's house to be educated: if you were a 'swot,' you went to school. It was part of the achievement of the Renaissance and the Reformation that the two educations were merged together in uneasy partnership. In England, they nearly broke asunder in the seventeenth century. One strong-willed man held them together. His name was Richard Busby. He feared no man, not even the King, which was a great deal to say in those

days. Westminster, where Busby was Headmaster, is the true nursing-mother of modern English public school education. It combines the training of the squire and the scholar. So long as this combination goes on, the old tradition of English life will not be lost.

But can it go on? Economic pressure will force up intellectual standards in the English public schools. A good many boys of the squire type already fail to get into their fathers' colleges at Oxford. Possibly the same thing will happen in the public schools. And there is another change which is even more important. Many of us believe, and nearly everyone at election-time says, that everyone in England ought to be able to get a liberal education. This will be prodigiously expensive. Sir George Ernest May of Weybridge, who was Chairman of the Economy Committee, feels upset by the thought of the cost it would entail. A common notion is that, to avoid expense, we should pick out of every rank of society, slum and palace alike, the boys and girls who are worthy of receiving the highest kind of education and spend upon their training whatever it may cost in the interests of national well-being. It is generally assumed that the liberal education which fits everybody is the kind of education which flowers in its most beautiful form at Eton or Winchester, and Rugby and Gresham's School, Holt, and at famous girls' schools like Wycombe Abbey. As hardly anyone dares say that nearly every boy or girl should go to Eton, Winchester and Rugby, Holt or Wycombe Abbey up to the seventeenth or eighteenth year of their age, the idea is to eliminate at once those who are thought least likely to get advantage from it. How are you going to do this? The general answer is a written examination. And as the examination gets harder, as it must because the competition will be severe, the question will arise whether you are going to allow people who can afford it to send their children to these schools on payment of a high fee, even though they cannot get a qualifying place in the entrance examination.

Taking all this into account, and looking over the sea of difficulties upon which we have embarked, I wonder whether, after all, the part of education which we test by written examinations is really the sort of education that we want to generalize

for universal use. I suspect that some of the virtue of English education lies in its possessing a number of things which we do not examine people in. I suspect, too, that if we dilute our English education to a strength which will bring it within reach of the public purse, it will not do much good to the nation to drink it. I doubt whether it might not do the nation harm to have it as its beverage.

Many of us here to-day believe that the earliest years of education are the most important — not exclusively important, but the most important of all. We know, from the experience of such schools as have been represented here to-day and from the work of the Hall School at Weybridge, where Miss Gilpin has made Eurhythmics an integral part of the education of children, that it is possible to give young children a really liberal education and that specialized training for classical entrance scholarships at the public schools is not the best education for them. I speak with deep respect of the excellence of the teaching and of the moral influence which goes with much of that specialized education, but I am convinced that, during the earlier years of life, a boy (and I suppose the same is true of a girl) should receive an education in which the training of the body and the training of the mind are much more completely integrated than is the case in the ordinary English preparatory school. But suppose that, for reasons of domestic finance, it is essential that our son should get an entrance scholarship at a public school and, beyond that, a scholarship at Balliol or New College, and our daughter at Somerville or Newnham, should we feel that we are justified, from a prudential point of view, in giving him or her an early education which might handicap him or her for the earlier and later scholarship tests? We might have, reluctantly, to give up the best for our children and send them through a course which we conceive to be more remunerative though, in itself, less beneficial.

Now this difficulty will in future, I believe, become more intense. Incomes from investments may shrink : costs of living may rise : family capital may be trenched upon. The intellectual pressure in our secondary schools may increase. In English education at present, the bright intellectual focus is rather small and is surrounded by a wide penumbra of other influences and

activities, all associated with the school and all fruitful. On the continent of Europe, where the economic pressure has come sooner than in England, the penumbra is narrower and the bright intellectual focus almost co-extensive with school life. Something indeed is done, especially in Germany and Scandinavia, to alleviate the intellectual strain by skilful gymnastic training. But, speaking broadly, the curse of European higher secondary education, excluding the English, is intellectual over-pressure in earlier years. Over-pressure, with its effect upon mind and judgment, is the black shadow upon modern European secondary education. We, in England, wear the collar more loosely at present. But the collar is tightening, and I am anxious for the future.

Nevertheless, let it not be forgotten that every country needs a literary and scientific élite. Some types of mind are capable of reaching a very high pitch of scholarship and learning. Civilization cannot dispense with them. It needs people like Casaubon and like Robinson Ellis. But you can hardly imagine either Casaubon or Robinson Ellis in a Dalcroze class. Probably that kind of education would not have suited them at all. They need a rather rarified education of a specialized sort. But, for the use of ordinary mortals, a diluted form of education which is good for Casaubon does not contain enough of vitamin D.

We have, therefore, to find some kind of liberal education which integrates body and mind, which gives outlet to the emotions and which has in it the discipline which shapes character without repressing variety of temperament. But in this education—the liberal education for everybody—we must preserve a fine literary tradition. That tradition is part of the civilization of the human race. In this connection, something arrested my attention at a private international conference at which German, French and British scholars were present last Whitsuntide. This is the practice of speaking the mother tongue in France and the kind of education which perfects that practice. You have only to get into a French third-class railway carriage and listen to the conversation to get an idea of what this tradition means, even for ordinary folk, in France, and when you talk to a well-educated Frenchman or Frenchwoman you see

the same effects on a much higher plane. This severe French training in the mother tongue is artistic and scientific. It is exact in grammatical discipline. It is stringent in its criticism of the use of words, but it is concerned with something far more vital than even the actual structure of the language. It shows itself in intonation, in rhythm, in modulated tones and, above all, in gesture and in the movement of the whole body. When a Frenchman begins to speak about something which is near his heart, he speaks very quietly and is almost motionless at first. But then something begins to glow in his mind : emotion and intellectual passion light up his words, and the words themselves have an accompanying rhythm of gesture and bodily movement.

Perhaps it is through some such teaching of our English mother tongue that we, in this country, may find the core of an integrated education.

I would end by repeating what I said at the beginning : that the training of the body is of fundamental importance in education : and that Monsieur Jacques Dalcroze is quite right in saying that education is an active force concerned with volitional power and with the regulation of vital functions. He is right in saying that in education we must not neglect what he calls 'physical consciousness.' But the more we prize physical consciousness, the more we honour the beauty of the body and the rhythm of its disciplined movements, the more sternly must we guard ourselves against the danger of the corruption which brought Greek education to the grave; and the more we shall need the bridle of ethical principle. But, in my judgment, the strength and power to use this bridle comes from a firm and lasting belief in the presence and power of Unseen Things.

AN APPRECIATION OF DR. OMAN

IN the interests of that new *caritas theologica* which the late Sir Harry Reichel described in the April issue of *The Modern Churchman* last year as having superseded the *odium theologicum* of former days, it is proposed in the following pages to give an account of one who is held in high regard in the Church which he serves as a distinguished teacher and who is recognized in wider circles as the bearer of an authentic and living Christian message.

Dr. John Oman has been for the last twenty-four years Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics at Westminster College, Cambridge, the training college of students for the ministry of the Presbyterian Church of England, and during a portion of that period he held the appointment of Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Cambridge. A native of Orkney, he was educated in Scotland and Germany, and in addition to the doctorate of philosophy of Edinburgh University, he holds more than one honorary doctorate of divinity. On being ordained he was for a few years minister of a small Presbyterian congregation in Northumberland—not many miles distant from that little village of Embleton, where a generation or so earlier one Mandell Creighton had combined parish work with serious research—and while there he accomplished what, regarded as the first fruits of his studies, must be deemed a notable achievement, namely, the translation, with introduction, of Schleiermacher's *Speeches on Religion*, a work which though epoch-making for theological thought had not till then appeared in an English form. Shortly afterwards (1902) he published his first original work, *Vision and Authority*, which, as he explained in the preface, was begun 'with no thought beyond the more practical issues of the present ecclesiastical situation,' but which had grown to be 'an inquiry into the foundations on which all Churches rest.' This work attracted no widespread notice and in due course went out of print, but its true value was brought to light a year or two ago when it triumphantly stood the

test of re-publication, in substantially unaltered form, after an interval of five-and-twenty years, being acclaimed in the most varied ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical quarters as the work of a genuinely prophetic mind.

Vision and Authority was followed successively by *The Problem of Faith and Freedom in the Last Two Centuries* (1906); *The Church and the Divine Order* (1911); *The War and its Issues* (1915); *Grace and Personality* (1918, third edition 1925); *The Paradox of the World*, a volume of Sermons (1921); and, finally, his *magnum opus*, *The Natural and the Supernatural*, which was published in September of last year. To these may be added *The Book of Revelation* (1927), an essay in New Testament criticism, in which he propounds an ingenious and attractive theory of the composition of that much-disputed book. In 1922 he became Principal of Westminster College, and in May of last year he was elected Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England.

I.

As a key to understanding what is most characteristic in Dr. Oman's thinking, no better criterion perhaps can be found than that which he himself applies, particularly in *Faith and Freedom* and *The Natural and the Supernatural*, in estimating the significance both of great spiritual movements such as the *Aufklärung* and Romanticism and of their leading representatives. That criterion is, first, the special interest displayed whether by the movement as a whole or by each individual thinker in it, and second, the method of investigation predominantly employed. Dr. Oman is, to a greater degree than the vast majority of his readers, steeped in the post-Reformation theology and philosophy both of this country and of Germany, and when he moves with such ease and freedom up and down the intertwining currents of thought on these two subjects throughout the past three centuries, it is this double clue of interest and method that he is following and that determines the conclusions he arrives at. After all we have learned the salient things about any thinker when we know what he is mainly interested in and what are the methods by which he seeks to establish his conclusions. And in the case of Dr. Oman it is the consistent maintenance of the

special interest with which he approaches the subject-matter of theology and his undeviating application of the method he employs in handling it that more than anything else stamps his teaching as a body of living truth, giving it the quality of wholeness which is the wholeness not of a mechanical system but of a living organism.

First, then, as to Dr. Oman's dominating interest.

Although on the ground of the position he occupies and the subjects he handles in his books Dr. Oman may justly be described as a theologian—and in the opinion of many he is a great theologian—yet his own true interest and outstanding service to the religious thought of our day consists in his deliberate restriction of his theological thinking within the sphere determined by the facts and experiences of the religious life. Every theology presupposes a living religion, but not every theology has been a religious theology in the sense that it has been content to seek its data and its criteria in religion itself rather than in things extraneous to it. Like Schleiermacher, who connected theological study with the harmonious guidance of the Church, Dr. Oman holds theology to be the handmaid of religion, and he has no interest in abstract speculations about God and man, the truth of which cannot be tested in the experiment of life. Theology for him is not the doctrine of God but the doctrine of God in His relation to men and women, and the only truth it should seek to explore and expound is truth that is relevant to the lives of human beings. Of a certain type of theology with which we are only too familiar he says :

> 'From disconnected tags of verses information is derived on every kind of subject in this world and the next, in earth and heaven. Especially the origin of the world and the destiny of man have been declared to the last detail. The result never was much to edification, and more recently it has been mainly to the encouragement of scepticism about the whole business of theology, root and branch.'

In theology of this type the interest is plainly not religious, nor is this the only type that starts with a wrong kind of interest. There is the type that yields to the specious demand that theological study must be 'disinterested,' or otherwise its results are discredited in advance. Against this Dr. Oman urges the unreasonableness of a demand which no one dreams of making in the case of any other study, and insists that in religion it is the

religious person who has the sole right to be heard, which is another way of saying, what this age sorely needs to learn, that in matters of religion a godly 'bus-conductor is a surer guide than either a popular novelist or a philosophical scientist whose qualifications to speak do not include any experience of the thing he is discussing. For understanding the things of God the prime need is the religious attitude and the spiritual mind.

III.

Dr. Oman's method is in keeping with his dominating interest. Each kind of reality, he says, has its own kind of witness, and this must determine its own kind of method; and religion being concerned with a reality which is seeking to reveal itself through our whole experience in this present world,

> 'it requires us to reach out after our farthest vision and follow even the dimly-discerned beckoning of its requirements, as they speak to us of what is beyond demonstration and only discerned in moments of deeper insight and higher concentration.'

Or, in other words, the only true method is to survey our environment 'from the highest standpoint we can reach, with all our experience and all our insight as well as knowledge.'

And for a religious theology that standpoint cannot be the heavens above, but must be the earth beneath, the ground-level of the religious life on which the intercourse of God with man and of man with God takes place.

> 'For mapping out from above God's operations it must be admitted we occupy no vantage ground. We are not able at all to soar, and we look up with no eagle eye. Only if we can see grace as it works on earth and understand it as it affects our own experience, can we possibly hope to have either clearness or certainty.'

Dr. Oman's latest book, *The Natural and the Supernatural*, may justly be described as a treatise on the true method in theology and as a brilliant exemplification of it, and for that reason those criticisms which have been made of the order in which he elects to treat the problems he is discussing must be regarded as but another instance of the lack of understanding which, as he somewhere remarks, he has received at the hands of some professional theologians 'who start by expecting what they do not find and with presuppositions which I do not grant.' There is the less excuse for these criticisms in that it is Dr. Oman's whole thesis that his method is the precise opposite of the one which

from the days of the rationalistic movement in the eighteenth century onwards has prevailed in theology, to its undoing, and which is historically associated with the name of Descartes. That method he characterizes as 'starting from a simple fact or a self-evident postulate and building up by facts which seem to come out of the original fact or reasonings which evolve from the original postulate.'

But religion is, above all else, concerned with 'moving about in worlds not realized.'

> 'If there are such things in the world as a freedom which reaches beyond itself, and values not yet realized, and a purpose which makes things as they are have their meaning beyond them, they cannot be dealt with by a method which looks exclusively to what is lower for the manifestation of the higher, and to dividing up difficulties. If this method assume itself to be the only valid method of knowledge, it will already have ruled out the possibility that the universe has any supernatural aspect, or at least that this could have any significance for us.'

And, more positively:

> 'That the knowledge of God should require an arduous discipline is only to say that the finite with difficulty reaches up to the Infinite, the creature to the Creator; is only to say that all man's powers find their full exercise in the knowledge of God, and that all creation only serves its full purpose when it reveals Him. The knowledge of God must be difficult, for it requires a true and proportioned life. It demands all our earnestness. How should we despise the Highest if we sought Him with anything less than our best endeavour? It demands conscientiousness. How should we draw near the Holiest, if not by following the best we know? It demands penitence. How should we hope to have fellowship with the Infinite Purity if we cherish anything with which He may not dwell? It demands humility. How with pride in our hearts either towards God or towards man can we know a Love that condescends from the throne of heaven to the lowliest on the earth? If that be the necessary discipline it is not easy.'

This last quotation reveals the absolute congruity between interest and method in Dr. Oman's teaching, and it explains his repudiation of every method that, reducing all truth to what can be proved by abstract reasoning, gives a free ticket of admission to the theological field to persons whose equipment is more intellectual than religious; that, working with hypotheses and spacious generalizations, makes theories the measure of its facts instead of facts the measure of its theories; and that in the definitions of religion it starts with or arrives at is equally capable of explaining it out of existence altogether and of explaining it in terms of what it certainly is not.

IV.

When it comes to summarizing Dr. Oman's thought that quality of articulated wholeness which has been mentioned above creates a difficulty in knowing where we are to begin. We may not, for instance, start with his doctrine of God and then proceed to his doctrine of man, for in a religious theology there cannot be a doctrine of God which leaves out man nor a doctrine of man that leaves out God. The familiar and handy, and the handier the more misleading, divisions of the subject simply do not exist for him, for they are the creation of a wrong method impelled by a wrong interest. This does not mean that his teaching is pathless and indeterminate; on the contrary it is systematic in the sense that all roads lead from Rome and, what is equally important, return to it; so that when once the central positions have been grasped it is seen that his thinking, to put it crudely, is all of a piece, as much as, shall we say, the circulatory system of the blood.

As a guiding principle we may take his doctrine of grace, partly because it very obviously belongs to the order of experience, and also because it keeps us to the main highway from which we may see down some of the more important branching avenues. Grace for Dr. Oman is the quality which distinguishes God's eternal and unchanging relationship towards man. It is that which sets the key to all His dealings with His children, being of His essential nature and not something which man can earn on the one hand or fall out of on the other, for it is that which conditions the indissoluble relationship between God and man and determines all God's operations directed towards man, alike those in which He plainly manifests His love and goodness, and, at the other extreme, those which Scripture describes as coming under the heading of His wrath.

This conception of grace has far-reaching consequences in many directions. It first of all disposes of the idea found in too many theologies of God as an entity disparate from man, almost incommensurable in fact with him, 'circumscribed on every hand by considerations of His own dignity,' bent on fulfilling His own sovereign purposes and maintaining His own paramount interests. And, starting from the major premise that we can only know God by standing within the relationship which He

Himself has graciously established, it rules out all speculation as to what He is in His essential existence and restricts our thoughts of Him to that knowledge which can only be gained by personal intercourse with Him in faith and trust.

Further, as grace is concerned with the succour of God's children and not with the display of His sovereignty, we must, if we are to learn the manner of its working, consider the nature of the personality which is to be succoured and not give rein to *a priori* theories as to the way in which it is seemly and proper for Omnipotence and Omniscience to act. Especially must we reject all theories of grace as something irresistibly applied and mechanically imparted, for in that way the personality is not succoured but overridden. In *Grace and Personality* Dr. Oman tackles this problem of the relation of the divine to the human from the only end from which it can be rightly tackled, namely, the human end, showing that, the fulfilment of the moral person being the attainment of his freedom in God, what is of the highest importance in theology is so to conceive God's action upon man that while on the one hand the supreme interest of religion, namely, absolute dependence on God, is maintained, on the other hand the supreme interest of personality, namely, moral independence, is not surrendered.

From the same source, namely, the conception of divine grace as succouring human personality into freedom, comes Dr. Oman's rejection of all authority in religion except that which commends itself to the insight and conscience of him who submits to it. Man being made in the image of God has in regard to spiritual things powers of recognition and response which, however feeble and however misdirected, are the sole guide to any possession of spiritual truth that can be called his own. To insist that he should surrender himself to other guidance imposed from without, whether of an infallible Church or an infallible Bible, is not only to depart from God's own method of patience and persuasion, but is to do violence to man in his most vital part, for 'truth is not truth for us, except as we ourselves see it; and right is not righteous, except as we ourselves determine it; and to determine our own beliefs by our own reason, and our own duty by our own conscience, is man's highest and most personal concern, which he may not delegate with honour.'

Hence Dr. Oman's view of revelation as something quite other than information about divine things authoritatively imparted and submissively received.

> 'The great task of a revelation can never be to demonstrate itself; but is to demonstrate itself in such a way that it shall always continue to be of the nature of a discovery for man, of the nature of an attainment and a victory, in such a way as not to demand abject submission but to enlarge and perfect freedom.'

And he follows this with words on the authority of Christ which deserve full quotation.

> 'The great demonstration of the Christ is that He never sets Himself, as the absolute external authority of the perfect truth, in opposition to the imperfect authority of the finite and sinful spirit within, but that He has only one appeal, which is to the likeness of God and the teaching of God within. Jesus speaks indeed with authority. He is not as the scribes. They had authorities, but no authority. They had nothing to speak from direct, and nothing to appeal to direct. Jesus, on the other hand, speaks from man to man the truth He has seen and to which His hearers are not blind unless they shut their eyes. Exclusively he addresses Himself to the primal spiritual authority in man, to the spiritual vision which discerns things spiritual. He is not as the scribes, precisely because, when He failed there, He would not lengthen a chain which had no support. On the contrary, He was able to exclude every other appeal except the appeal to the spiritual in man. No man accepted the truth from Him for any lower reason than because it had appealed to his heart as true.'

A theology which reads the divine method thus and seeks to draw out all its implications is bound to have far-reaching consequences affecting our judgment on all questions relating to the Church, its worship, sacraments, creed, ministry, organization, and unity; and these consequences Dr. Oman follows out, tracing back to an essential scepticism all those devices—external guarantees, divinely authenticated dogmatic traditions, official hierarchies, and the like—by which timid piety and worldly prudence combined have sought to safeguard the interests of truth and order and stability; and placing the whole burden of maintaining these high interests where God Himself has placed it, on the freedom wherewith Christ has made men free.

V.

Space forbids further illustration of Dr. Oman's leading thoughts and of their living interaction. Suffice it to say that his is a preachable theology as few theologies are, for, having as its

subject-matter the truth that all can see who will consent to see, it links the preacher and his hearers in a fellowship that is truly personal, that proceeding by the method of the appeal to conscience has for its aim nothing short of individual conviction. As a teacher of religious teachers, Dr. Oman believes that the servant of the Lord should not strive nor cry, but pin his faith to 'the power of belief,' which means 'the power of our message to commend itself and do its own work.' His criticism of much ecclesiastical and clerical busyness is that it 'trusts, even in religion, the things seen and temporal, and does not take much stock of the power of things unseen and eternal.' Had the Church greater faith that 'if the light is there it will shine through of itself into the darkness,' there would be less reliance on visible substitutes for trust in God and in the power of His truth, and the Christianity which has failed to coerce and is more and more failing to impress would be all the better able to attract and to persuade.

G. K. MacBean.

ROME AND JERUSALEM

FROM time to time during the last few years, Italy has put out feelers in the direction of taking over the Palestine Mandate. Since the entente between the Italian Church and State became effective these have been more pointedly addressed through the medium of press comments and the attitude of the Latin Church in Palestine. Those who saw the film showing General Allenby's entry into Jerusalem in December, 1917, must have been struck by the prominence of the Italian military representative in the various scenes; no other foreign member was so apparent.

When the tumult and the shouting that followed upon the British liberation of Palestine had subsided, it was possible for the victors to take stock of what had survived the War, and to see what remained for use in reconstruction. It was immediately apparent that the Church of Palestine—the Orthodox Church—was financially in a state of exhaustion nigh unto death. The Church had lost its main sources of support, namely, from Russia—a pre-War Russian consul estimated that each one of the thou-

sands of Russian pilgrims was worth not less than £10 to Palestine per annum, and this apart from alms, grants, and other financial help received from Imperial Russia up to 1914: from Bessarabia, where the Jerusalem Patriarchate possessed much wealthy property through the pious bequests of former Rumanian princes: and from its own ancient and valuable holdings in Palestine. At one blow all these sources of life had been cut off; land and property in Palestine were rendered non-productive and unsaleable by the War; Russia fell a prey to Bolshevism; Rumania annexed the Patriarchate property within her borders for her own Church's use. The other Orthodox Patriarchates were all more or less suffering, and powerless to help Jerusalem, which had had to borrow money at fearful rates of interest in order to keep going at all during the War years. The Patriarch Damianos (whose death took place in August, 1931, after a long illness) was exiled to Damascus by the Turks, and returned to his charge only after the British had taken Jerusalem. By that time, the Patriarchate was over £400,000 in debt, and it was only saved by the Military Administration immediately declaring a moratorium. One of the first duties of the first High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, was to appoint a Commission of enquiry into the financial position of the Patriarchate, under Sir Anton Bertram, formerly Chief Justice of Cyprus. The findings of this Commission were published in 1921 ('Report of the Commission appointed by the Government of Palestine to Inquire into the Affairs of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem.' Oxford University Press, 1921), a work of lasting value and interest. Thereafter a permanent commission of three persons had charge of the finances of the Patriarchate, whose discreet, patient, and disinterested labours have not received due recognition either from the Government or the public. This body was authorized by an Order in Council (Government of Palestine) to sell certain properties belonging to the Orthodox Church in Palestine to pay its debts and the large interest chargeable thereon (in some cases 40 per cent.), and restore its income. Though great care and caution were exercised in these sales, the Palestine Arabs, both Christians and Moslems, heartily disliked them, for at the moment almost the only bidders with ready money were Zionists, and in this way much land passed from Christian

into Jewish hands. The Latin Patriarchate also bought some (and more later on), and the Orthodox Arabs certainly preferred this, in spite of mutual age-long antagonisms, for the buyers were at least Christians.

So much of past history is necessary if we are to understand the present situation.

The Latin Church in Palestine had suffered also in the War; buildings had been requisitioned by the Turks for military and other emergency uses, and monks and priests had been sent into exile in the interior; but the Turks, as a rule, respected churches and did not destroy property unnecessarily. Moreover, the Latin Church in Palestine had many German members and German-owned religious buildings, and Turco-German animosity was focussed upon Latins who were subjects of the Allies; and the Church itself had never been subject politically to Turkey, as were the Eastern Churches. Her afflictions therefore were of a temporary character only, and her recuperative powers were unimpaired. An unlimited opportunity for advancement and consolidation lay for her in the threatened collapse of the Orthodox Church, the complete disappearance of the all-powerful Russian Church, and the general dislocation of the other Eastern Churches, all of whom, except the Coptic and the Abyssinian, had been severely affected by the downfall of Turkey, so long their suzerain power. This opportunity the Latin Church was quick to note and grasp. Wastage in personnel and in things material was made good as far as possible, and there was no apparent shortage of funds. The Latin Patriarchate began to buy land in large portions; certain villages have passed almost entirely under Latin ownership, partly by purchase and partly by capture, a term which may serve as well as any other to describe the enforced 'conversion' of Orthodox Arabs to the Roman Church in return for the material aid (bread allowances, free rooms, sick benefit, etc.) which it rendered on that condition when their own Church had grown too poor any longer to support its poor, aged, and other dependents.

The Latin Church was undoubtedly a free agent in its policy and forward movement in Palestine, but in so far as the strongest foreign influence there now is the Italian, Italian politics and Italian prestige are noticeably affected for good by that Church's

advancement. The alliance between the Papacy and the Italian State will nowhere be more mutually amicable and more mutually profitable. To those who knew Italy's minor position in Palestine before the War, these developments are significant.

Students of modern history as it is made day by day, 'line upon line, here a little and there a little,' will have observed that the Latin Church in Palestine has made no secret of its sympathy with the Arabs and its antagonism to Zionism. In this way it has adopted the rôle of pre-War Russia, who constituted herself the protectress of Christianity in Palestine and based her whole policy of provocation, claim, acquisition, and control of Turkey upon that mighty foundation. Such students will have noted also that the only power which condemned unequivocally Great Britain's administration of the Palestine Mandate was Italy. Unquestionably, Italy desires the Mandate for Palestine, which would make her practically the dominant power in Near Eastern politics. Already firmly established in Egypt, her nationals there would be separated from Palestine by a sea or cross-desert train journey of a few hours only. As guardian *de facto* of the Holy Land, wherein are found the shrines dearest to all Christendom, as well as Moslem sites which rank next to Mecca in sanctity, and the seed of Jewish hope, her influence throughout the religious world would be second to none.

What would be the result if England abandoned the Mandate for Palestine and Italy took it up? The first and immediate consequence would be bloodshed over the Holy Places. The Latin Church has long vehemently desired increased rights and representation in all these, but especially in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre: throughout the Orthodox ceremony of the Holy Fire, a Franciscan monk stands at the entry to the shrine itself, in witness of the rights already possessed therein by Rome. The Franciscan establishment in Palestine dates only from 1219, but it is the oldest, strongest, and most influential of all the many Latin Orders in Palestine. The 'Intendant' (Warden) ranks as an abbot, and is the head of numerous courts in the Near East; he is always referred to as 'Reverendissimo,' and is called by the Latins 'The Guardian of Holy Mount Zion and Custodian (Custos) of the Holy Land'—a fairly comprehensive title. The Custos must be an Italian by birth, and one is ap-

pointed or confirmed in office every three years by the Vatican. His Vicar ('Vicarius sive praeses') or representative during illness or absence, might formerly be a Frenchman, but now must be either an Italian or a Spaniard; his appointment also is triennial, and if the Custos dies while in office, he succeeds him. The Custos was the spiritual head of all the Roman Catholic communities in Palestine and Syria (except that on Mount Carmel and the Jesuit House in the Lebanon) until the foundation of the Latin Patriarchate in 1847, a fact which has led to some little jealousy and internal friction. Many of the Franciscan monks in Palestine are Italian time-expired soldiers, and the level of culture is not as high as in other communities, though the wealth is greater than that of most. The Orthodox Bishopric, or Patriarchate, of Jerusalem claims its direct descent from the Apostolic Church presided over by St. James, but after the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) it was attached to the See of Caesarea, which then became the civil capital of Palestine, until the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) re-established it as a separate Patriarchate. The late Patriarch, Damianos, was 132nd Bishop of Jerusalem. The Orthodox Church being therefore the Church of Palestine, the majority of the native Christians belong to its fold. It has the chief rights in the Holy Places, and its unique position is acknowledged by all the other Churches, including our own, as it was acknowledged by the Porte in the days of Turkish rule. But in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, all the Churches—Coptic, Latin, Armenian, Russian, Syrian, Abyssinian—have their own jealously-guarded rights (so, too, have many of the old *Orthodox* Arab families), as well as their own chapels and shrines. Under the laxity of Turkish rule, fights and bloodshed in the holy places were frequent, and they would follow upon the least infringement by one of another's rights, such as a Latin footstep upon a Greek-owned carpet; it is only since the British came that these unseemly fights have ceased. In the opinion of those who know Palestine it is inconceivable that, with Italy in authority as Mandatory Power, the Latin Church would not advance claims to the Holy Places, whether of representation or of guardianship, which all the Eastern Churches would certainly resent and oppose, to the shedding of blood again on both sides.

Even more injurious to the cause of peace in Christendom would be the check set on the movement for unity between the far-flung Anglican Communion and the Orthodox Church, which has been so notably advanced by the recent official Orthodox acknowledgment of Anglican Orders. The Church of England has never denied Orthodox Orders, and individual Orthodox priests and prelates have long since acknowledged Anglican Orders, so that intercommunion has been practised unofficially by members of both Churches to their mutual benefit; but this is the most magnificent effort after Christian Unity that has been made—we dare not say in how many centuries of 'religious' strife and division. The Orthodox Church in Palestine has a peculiar position which is acknowledged by the English Church no less than by the other Eastern Churches, and anything that cramped or hindered relations between Jerusalem and Canterbury would have dark consequences for both East and West. The standing of Canterbury indeed would be unshaken; but who that knows the methods and policy of the Roman Church in Palestine can doubt the adverse pressure brought to bear, the covert thwarting and oppression in all sorts of ways, against which the Churches of the East, but especially the Orthodox, must labour, under a Latin Church Mandatory Power?

We have touched but lightly upon issues of such far-reaching and momentous consequence that Englishmen may well pause to follow them out, even at this time of national preoccupation. The Arabs themselves are fully aware of the consequences to them and to their country which would follow upon any change in the Mandatory Power, though Latin Church sympathies may be said to be with them and not with the Zionists. Discussing this point with a Moslem Arab leader, nearly two years ago, the writer remarked that if the British were to drop the Palestine Mandate, in response to Arab agitation and Zionist ingratitude, Italy would almost certainly press the League of Nations to give it to her instead. His answer was: 'Do we not know it? And if the Latins got it—why, heaven help us all in Palestine!'

E. M. E. Blyth

(Sometime Private Secretary to the late Anglican Bishop (Blyth) in Jerusalem.)

THE MARRIAGE LAW

RECENT ACTS IN RELATION TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

J. F. Worsley-Boden, D.Litt.

I.

IT is important at the outset to recognize that 'in-law' marriages must not be confused with the re-marriage in church of persons who have been through the Divorce Court. This last has long been matter of controversy, not only since the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 gave statutory authority for such re-marriage, but in a qualified measure ever since the Reformation. On this point the matrimonial conflicts of Henry VIII are not themselves relevant; for the defeasance of his marriages, where this was not by death, was matter of annulment and not of dissolution. But the difficulty may be said to have been begun in his reign with the case of the Marquis of Northampton, whose 'divorce' in 1542 was of the Canon Law variety known as *a mensa et thoro* ('from bed and board'): a decree which passed out of official use in English law when the Act of 1857 (20 & 21 Vict. c. 85), s. 7, replaced it by that of judicial separation. The re-marriage of the Marquis in 1547 was approved by a court of Bishops and afterwards validated by an Act of Parliament of 5 & 6 Ed. VI, which pronounced him to be 'seperate divorsed and at libertie by the Lawes of God to marrie.' From that time until the Act of 1857 divorce, in the accepted legal sense of dissolution which carries the right of re-marriage, was obtainable in England on the ground of adultery, but only by a cumbrous process. It required (i) a suit in the Ecclesiastical Court for the decree *a mensa et thoro*, (ii) a Common Law suit for damages against the wife's paramour, and (iii) a private Act of Parliament; which last step (iii) alone effected the dissolution with the liberty to marry again. There were many of such Acts before 1857; and notable among them was Dillon's case in 1701, when for the first time the House of Lords functioned as a judicial body, hearing counsel and witnesses. The purposes of this elaborate and expensive procedure was re-marriage; for otherwise the decree *a mensa et thoro* would have been sufficient.

Now it is quite clear that re-marriage meant marriage in church, unless the marriage were clandestine; and it was the object of the Legislature (at the instance, it seems, of Chancery or criminal lawyers, or both), as expressed in 26 Geo. II, c. 33, well known as Lord Hardwicke's Act of 1753, to prevent clandestine marriage, and therefore to insist on marriage in church in accordance with the provisions which were statutorily ordered.

During this period of 300 years, from the Reformation to 1857, it might be said that, except for certain episcopal efforts to check the practice of re-marriage — notably in the reign of Elizabeth—the element of controversy attaching to this question was exhibited mainly in the Parliamentary debates on private Acts; and the Bishops in the House of Lords were sometimes found to speak and vote for the divorce and re-marriage, as *e.g.* Bishop Cosin in the case of Lord Roos in 1669, quoted in the Duke of Norfolk's case in 1700.

In 1857 jurisdiction in Matrimonial Causes passed from the Church to the State. In brief terms it may be said that the Legislature gave statutory form to the Canon Law; but admitted one new ground, adultery, as ground of dissolution (*N.B.*—New as statute law, but familiar as a ground in the previous Parliamentary procedure), and provided for the re-marriage of parties whose marriage has been dissolved. In the meantime, by 6 & 7 Will. IV, c. 85, and later Acts, provision had been made and regulated for the celebration of marriages by certificate or licence of a Superintendent Registrar — the method which is commonly recommended for *divorcés* to-day by Churchmen who are averse to giving them ecclesiastical hospitality. Yet, in spite of this provision for Civil Marriage, the Legislature in 1857 provided for re-marriage in church in the following terms (20 & 21 Vict., c. 85, 57 & 58):

> S. 57 [After provision made for time for Appeal (afterwards amended to admit of decree absolute)]
>
> '. . . it shall be lawful for the respective parties thereto to marry again, as if the prior marriage had been dissolved by death: Provided always, that no clergyman in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland shall be compelled to solemnize the marriage of any person whose former marriage may have been dissolved on the ground of his or her adultery, or shall be liable to any suit, penalty or censure for solemnizing or refusing to solemnize the marriage of any such person.'

S.58. 'Provided always, that when any minister of any church or chapel of the United Church of England and Ireland shall refuse to perform such marriage service between any persons who but for such refusal would be entitled to have the same service performed in such church or chapel, such minister shall permit any other minister in Holy Orders of the said United Church, entitled to officiate within the diocese in which such church is situate, to perform such marriage service in such church or chapel.'

These sections were repealed, but re-enacted in the same sense *mutatis mutandis* (*e.g.* 'Church of England' for 'United Church,' etc.) by the Judicature (Consolidation) Act, 1925 (15 and 16 Geo. V, c. 49), s. 184 (1), (2), (3).

The provisions of the Statute are plain. The innocent party is entitled to the use of the parish church and the services of the parochial clergy on the same terms as any other parishioner. The guilty party is entitled to the use of the parish church, but cannot claim the services of the incumbent or his staff. But if the incumbent is unwilling to solemnize the marriage, he is yet required to allow any qualified clergyman to do so in the parish church. Thus the discretion given to the parish clergy applies only in the case of the guilty party, in which case the clergy are free to solemnize or to refuse. But both parties, innocent and guilty alike, share the title of any parishioner to the use of the church. If on any other ground, in the case of any parishioner, that title could be shown to be inoperative or inept, then it would so be on that said other ground in the case of one who happened to be a *divorcé*; but under the statute such ground is not furnished by dissolution of marriage.

II.

Leaving the issue of re-marriage after dissolution as satisfactorily settled (except that the Church commonly repudiates the statute), we are confronted by another and more recent problem. The Marriage (Prohibited Degrees of Relationship) Acts, 1907-1931, have also made provision for marriage in church, but on terms more generous to the clergy who have conscientious scruples. In the previous case the statutory discretion provided that the clergy should not be compelled to solemnize the marriages of those who by the Court's decree were, or were

presumed to be adulterers. In the case of the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act, 1907 (7 Ed. VII, c. 47), the clergy were given a complete discretion to marry or to refuse; and there appears therefore in this case to be no saving of the old right to the use of the parish church. Section 1 of 'the principal Act' —which also determines the conditions of marriage in church under the Deceased Brother's Widow's Marriage Act, 1921 (11 and 12 Geo. V, c. 24), and the Marriage (Prohibited Degrees of Relationship) Act, 1931 (21 & 22 Geo. V, c. 31)—runs thus:

> 1. 'No marriage heretofore or hereafter contracted between a man and his deceased wife's sister, within the realm or without, shall be deemed to have been or shall be void or voidable, as a civil contract, by reason only of such affinity: Provided always that no clergyman in Holy Orders in the Church of England shall be liable to any suit, penalty or censure, whether civil or ecclesiastical, for anything done or omitted to be done by him in the performance of the duties of his office to which suit, penalty or censure he would not have been liable if this Act had not been passed.
>
> Provided also, that when any minister of any church or chapel of the Church of England shall refuse to perform such marriage service between any persons who, but for such refusal, would be entitled to have the same service performed in such church or chapel, such minister may permit any other clergyman in Holy Orders in the Church of England, entitled to officiate within the diocese in which such church or chapel is situate, to perform such marriage service in such church or chapel.'
>
> (The remainder of S.1 is irrelevant to the present point.)

Thus it will be observed that the claims of the parties, whether deceased wife's sister, deceased brother's widow, deceased wife's niece or deceased husband's nephew, are smaller than in the case of a *divorcé* (*i.e.* a guilty *divorcé*; for the case of an innocent party to a divorce suit is not in issue, being precisely that of a parishioner with the customary title to marriage in the parish church). In the case of a guilty *divorcé*, the incumbent, if he refuses to solemnize the marriage himself, is compellable to allow the marriage in the parish church if a duly qualified clergyman can be found who is willing to solemnize it; but in the case of a deceased wife's sister, etc., he is competent, but not compellable, to allow another clergyman to solemnize the marriage. In the one case the admission of the parties, and of the qualified clergyman, is coercive; in the other, the admission of either appears to be only permissive. In the one case the

statute provides that 'he *shall* permit,' etc.; in the other it reads, 'he *may* permit,' etc.[1]

But where a discretion is given—(1) in the case of the marriage of a guilty *divorcé* (*a*) to solemnize the marriage, or (*b*) to refuse personally, but to allow another clergyman, to solemnize it; (2) in the case of a deceased wife's sister, etc. (*a*) to solemnize the marriage, or (*b*) to refuse, but to allow another clergyman, to solemnize it, or (*c*) to refuse to permit the marriage in church at all—the discretion is given to the incumbent himself, and he is not subject to any suit, penalty or censure on either hand, *i.e.* on the ground of solemnizing or refusing to solemnize.

Quaere: Where the discretion given to the clergy is saved by the statute, what is the title of a Diocesan Bishop to intervene to prevent the solemnization of the marriage, or (what is less probable) to secure it?

III.

Such being the statute law, it remains to enquire into the validity of the common ecclesiastical objection to its provisions. Leaving the theological treatment of this question aside, a few legal points may suitably be dealt with here, since they have been raised in recent controversy. On the re-marriage of *divorcés*, whether innocent or guilty, bishop after bishop (with the exception of an occasional voice in favour of re-marriage) has in the last year or two, apart from earlier history, recommended refusal in spite of the statute. On the point of the marriage of persons under the Marriage (Prohibited Degrees of Relationship) Acts, 1907-1931, likewise there have been expressions of opinion against the solemnizing of such marriages. But it will be remembered that the Bishop of Liverpool, when asked for his advice on the point, recommended the Registrar's Office, but added that if the incumbent thought that the

[1] In *Signs of the Times* (*Modern Churchman*, January, 1932, p. 533) the lesser right of marriage under the Marriage (Prohibited Degrees of Relationship) Acts, 1907-1931, is not quite clearly emphasized. The parties' 'right,' in the sense of permission, to be married in church is not disallowed by statute; but it is not an unqualified right because it is conditional on the goodwill of the incumbent, who not only may refuse to solemnize the marriage, but is not required, but only permitted, to allow another clergyman to step into the breach.

solemnizing of such marriages in church would be spiritually beneficial, he (presumably the Bishop, Dr. David himself; not the incumbent, *pace Signs of the Times*, *loc. cit.*) would raise no objection. The *Church Times* (December 24th, 1931), complaining that Dr. David had not sufficiently condemned such marriages, desired that he should have described them

'as being contrary to Divine, and not merely to ecclesiastical law. . . .'

The questions must therefore be asked, (1) What is ecclesiastical law? and (2) What is divine law?

(1) Ecclesiastical law is (*a*) the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church; but this (except as it governs Roman Catholics who are British subjects of English domicil) has not been operative in England since 25 Henry VIII, c. 19 (Act for the Submission of the Clergy, etc.) and 1 Eliz., c. 1 (Act of Supremacy), except where it survived under the Royal authority, not being repugnant to the Royal prerogative; which now means, only where it has been authorized, or not over-ridden, by statute. Therefore (*b*) ecclesiastical law in England to-day is the Law of the Realm in ecclesiastical causes. There is no independent 'Church law,' as such.

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister, etc., was contrary to ecclesiastical law while ecclesiastical law had a separate existence. Such a marriage was voidable in the Ecclesiastical Court until 1835, when by 5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 54, this ecclesiastical law became statutory, and such marriages were void. Until 1907 the marriage with a deceased wife's sister, until 1921 the marriage with a deceased brother's widow, and until 1931 the marriage with a deceased wife's niece and with a deceased husband's nephew, was in each case prohibited by the Law of the Realm (which had incorporated Canon Law); *i.e.* until the Legislature amended it by the Acts of those years. Therefore these marriages are not now contrary to English ecclesiastical law, but only to Roman Canon Law.

(2) A definition of divine law is not easy; but in Matrimonial Causes it has a significance which (in the absence of any proffered definition) presumably the *Church Times* intended to imply. An impediment of divine law is one which is necessary to the nature and institution of marriage, and such an impedi-

ment is properly not dispensable. In the Roman Church, where the Canon Law prevails, marriage with a deceased wife's sister, etc., is indeed subject to an *impedimentum dirimens* (*i.e.* a completely separating impediment, rendering the marriage null and void, as contrasted with *impedimentum impeditivum*, which is an obstructive, local or temporary, impediment, *e.g.* requiring parents' consent to marriage under the age fixed by the law of a particular country or the discipline of a particular Church). But not all *impedimenta dirimentia* are impediments of divine law. Some are capable of papal dispensation, and among them are those which else would nullify marriage with a deceased wife's sister, etc. These are not of divine law, because they are not necessary to the nature and institution of marriage; and these marriages are dispensable. Here arises another contrast which it may be thought necessary to state in the interest of clear understanding. This is the distinction between different diriment impediments; between the impediment which voids a deceased wife's sister's marriage, but is dispensable, and, *e.g.*, bigamy, which voids a marriage *ab initio*, or *vis et metus*, force and fear (*Anglicé* duress), which alike in Roman Canon Law and English Law eliminates free consent to a marriage and renders it null and void.[2]

If, then, marriages with a deceased wife's sister, with a deceased brother's widow, and *a fortiori* with a niece or a nephew by marriage, are thus dispensable in Canon Law, the claim that they are contrary to divine law can only rest on some authority which is unknown or indeterminable. If the Church of England proposes to repudiate both the English Statute Law and the Catholic Canon Law, there would seem to be no conceivable

[2] Cases could be cited to show to what extent the Roman Canon Law and the English Law resemble one another in this. *N.B.* — While the grounds of nullity are more numerous in the Roman Church than in English Law, it would seem to be a fair statement that in modern practice the conditions of relief are more stringent under the Roman Rota than in the English Court, except where incidentally, as in *Inverclyde's* case, [1931] P. 29, the law of domicil excludes jurisdiction, and may thus cause difficulty or hardship. The points of this footnote, as also the whole subject of this article, are more fully treated in my forthcoming book, *Mischiefs of the Marriage Law* (published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, price £1 1*s.* 0*d.*). For a very lucid exposition in small compass I would strongly recommend a little book by a Roman Catholic lawyer, *Nullity of Marriage*, by Mr. F. J. Sheed (published by Messrs. Sheed & Ward, 2/6).

basis of principle and action. As we have seen, there is for English Churchmen no independent 'ecclesiastical law,' because such Canon Law as is valid for them is incorporated in the Statutes. It is no doubt competent for the Church to create a new canon law of its own, but only within limits, because in the constitution of the Church of England such canon law must be straitly guarded against violation of existing law, or otherwise it must be incorporated in new statutes, repealing those which it would infringe, before it could claim validity.

One other point has arisen in discussion of this question. The *Church Times* suggests that Dr. David, in tolerating marriage under the Prohibited Degrees Acts, was allowing precisely what, in the case of Pope Julius II's dipensation to Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon,

> 'was held by the leaders of the Reformation to justify the repudiation of Papal authority by our Church.'

With all respect to a belief which has endured too long, it must be insisted that even the important matter of the annulment of Henry's 'marriage' with Catherine was not a substantive, but only an adjective, factor in the breach with Rome; and the question of the Pope's dispensation for the marriage was but incidental to that factor. If the dispensation had been invalid, there would have been no need for the nullity. Henry's marriage, his dissatisfaction with it, his doubt of its validity, and all the measureless negotiations thereupon, were not the real cause of the breach with the Papacy, but only the occasion through which the pent-up hostility of years found vent, when, as Professor Pollard shows (*Henry VIII*, p. 238), the only power which could have held it in check ceased to do so; and when, as we may add, that same power (to wit, the King) was glad to make use of it in order to defeat his opponents and to establish the Royal supremacy in place of the Papal power. In current practice this substituted supremacy has come to mean (1) the Statute Law (*i.e.* the Acts of the Legislature); (2) the administration of the said Statute Law by Judicial Decision; and (3) other lawful decrees (*e.g.* by Order in Council) issued under the Royal Command.

'IRRELIGIOUS SOLICITUDE FOR GOD'

THE phrase is from Hilary of Poitiers—*Irreligiosa solicitudo pro Deo*. Hilary's immediate reference was to certain contemporary philosophers who refused to believe in the Incarnation on the ground that it was dishonouring to God. It was a sacrilegious and blasphemous thought, they argued, to conceive that the Deity should become man. They felt constrained to take up arms to defend the dignity and majesty of the Divine Being, gravely impugned by the very suggestion that 'God was in Christ.' Instead of arguing from the facts—the sublime personality of Jesus, inexplicable solely in terms of manhood, and His teaching, with its unique filial consciousness—they began *a priori* with a certain theory of the Divine nature, a certain notion of what was becoming to God and what was unbecoming, and ruled out all that in their view was not congruous with it.

The same spirit of 'irreligious solicitude for God'—a nervous apprehension that the Deity was somehow in danger and needed defending—has persisted through the ages and is by no means unknown in our time. The purpose of this article is to indicate some of the forms it has taken, and is taking to-day, and to enter a plea for the opposite and more admirable temper.

(1)

The history of the ecclesiastical persecution of honest thinkers—that sad blot on the Church's fame—is just one long illustration of 'irreligious solicitude for God.' Galileo forced to abjure his beliefs and thrown into prison, Servetus and Giordano Bruno burned at the stake, Buffon compelled to retract his hypotheses, Tom Paine outlawed, Colenso 'excommunicated,' Maurice and Robertson Smith deprived of their professorships—so it goes on from generation to generation.

'There is scarcely any discovery which science has made for human advancement and happiness which churchmen and theologians have not violently opposed,' says Mr. C. E. M. Joad. 'They burnt the men who discovered the earth's motion, burnt the men who made the first tentative beginnings of physics and

chemistry, burnt the men who laid the foundations of our medical knowledge.'[1]

We must admit the truth of the indictment, and the salient point is that it was 'irreligious solicitude for God' that lit the fires. The stake went out of fashion as more humane times supervened, but the self-same spirit persisted. 'Had it been in the sixteenth, instead of the nineteenth, century,' said Dean Stanley in 1845, with reference to the degradation and censure of 'Ideal' Ward, 'just the same men, with just the same arguments, would have been voting, not for degradation, but for burning.'[2]

From the horrors of the Inquisition to the latest fulminations of Tennessee, from the fires of Smithfield to the most recent heresy hunt, history is full of evidences of the tenacity of the spirit of 'irreligious solicitude for God.' Some of the instances are, at this distance of time, amusing—or would be, if they were not so pitiful.

When Newton first proclaimed the law of gravitation, orthodox pulpits levelled their guns against him in anger and consternation. John Wesley said that Newton's theory 'tended to infidelity.' The same divine averred that 'the giving up belief in witchcraft is, in effect, giving up the Bible.' Sir Thomas Browne argued, in *Religio Medici*, that to deny witches was to be an atheist. Lightning-rods were vehemently denounced by many ministers as an unwarrantable interference with God's use of lightning. In the early nineteenth century, when railways became a practical proposal, many of the clergy preached against them as a sin against God. The following is from an American newspaper of a hundred years ago:

> 'You are welcome to use the schoolroom to debate proper questions in, but such things as railroads and telegraphs are impossibilities and rank infidelity. There is nothing in the Word of God about them. If God had designed that His intelligent creatures should travel at the frightful speed of fifteen miles an hour by steam He would have foretold it through His Holy Prophets. It is a device of Satan to lead immortal souls down to Hell.'[3]

The nexus between these curious exhibitions is the spirit of 'irreligious solicitude for God.' What led to all these remark-

[1] *Present and Future of Religion*, p. 150.

[2] R. E. Prothero (Lord Ernle), *Life of Dean Stanley*, Ch. 10 (Nelson's One Vol. Ed., p. 179).

[3] Quoted from *Daily News*, May 16, 1928.

able and diverting attacks on progress was the feeling that religion and God were in danger and must be defended, lest the one should be undermined and the other superseded.

'Arrogance,' says Mr. Basil King in his *Conquest of Fear*, 'is the special immorality of churches.'[4] On the face of it, that is a justifiable reading of the facts of history. Such facts as those mentioned, and many others that might be added, seem to be eloquent of ecclesiastical arrogance. But perhaps the substitution of 'apprehension' for 'arrogance' would represent a deeper diagnosis. Nervous fear of the consequences of free enquiry, a distrust of progress as being somehow inimical to the stability and even to the existence of the divine cause in the world—in other words, 'irreligious solicitude for God'—this is the 'special immorality of churches.'

(2)

Our sense of humour must not desert us when we come to later manifestations of the same spirit. Take, for instance, the controversies which followed the appearance of Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859:

> 'Great divines . . . maintained that the Genesis stories of the Creation and the Fall, and the Incarnation of our Lord, must stand or fall together; that if Evolution were accepted 'the entire scheme of man's salvation must collapse,' that the stories of Lot's wife and Jonah in their literal meaning were "vital" to Christianity.'[5]

In the early stages of the *Essays and Reviews* controversy, Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford declared that if men were persuaded to

> 'accept allegorically, or as parable, or poetry, or legend, the story of a serpent tempter, of an ass speaking with man's voice, of an arresting of the earth's motion, or of a reversal of its motion,'

they were in danger of being 'robbed unawares of the very foundations of the Faith.'[6]

The conception of God on which such an attitude was based is well described in the following passage:

> 'God was only supposed to be at work when mystery enshrouded all. Just as a conjuror, to maintain his reputation, must conceal how he does his tricks, so it seemed to be supposed that God, to retain His majesty, must shroud all His methods in mists and darkness. To probe the mystery was impious, to discover anything was to dethrone Him.'[7]

[4] P. 156.
[5] *Liberal Evangelicalism*, p. 21.
[6] Quoted from *Modern Churchman*, January, 1930, p. 579.
[7] *Liberal Evangelicalism*, ibid.

Instead of holding that all truth is God's truth, and that the discovery of it must be to His greater glory, the position taken up is that of the old lady faced for the first time by the theories of Darwin :

> 'Descended from monkeys? My dear, I trust that is not true; but if it is, let us pray that it may not become widely known.'

At all times it has been the usage first to condemn or to ignore, then to tolerate, and last of all to accept, each addition to the knowledge of the universe which man wins by use of the reason which God has given him, and the pioneers who do the winning are nearly always made to suffer by those who think they do God service.

By those who think they do God service—that is the tragedy of the situation. Infinitely more harm has been done to the cause of God by those associated with it than by those opposed to it. Writing in 1861, Dr. Hort—according to Bishop Barnes 'the greatest English theologian of the nineteenth century'[8]—says that

> 'a league is forming . . . to drive from the Church all who, whether orthodox or not, value truth above orthodoxy.'[9]

That league has existed in all ages, its basal principle is *irreligiosa solicitudo pro Deo*, and it has done more to hinder the progress of the Church than all the infidels and atheists that have ever lived. How often the Christian religion has needed to be saved from its friends!

(3)

We meet with the spirit of irreligious solicitude for God in our own days. It is amazing how people still seem to think, in spite of all the evidence which history affords of the fatuousness of the position, that God must be taken care of, as if He were not able to take care of Himself, and Truth protected, as if it were a delicate plant to be shielded from every adverse wind, and not an age-long tree which has so struck its roots into the foundations of the world that no blasts of opposition can overthrow it.

As I write there is before me a melancholy pamphlet entitled *The Duty of Controversy for the Faith*, issued by a Union of

[8] *Should Such a Faith Offend?* p. 227.
[9] *Life of Fenton J. A. Hort*, Vol. I, p. 440.

zealous Bibliolaters — a pamphlet which breathes the essential spirit of 'irreligious solicitude for God.' 'The Duty of Controversy for the Faith'! The very title is a confession of lack of faith, for all apprehension as to the inherent capacity of Truth to protect itself is intrinsically faithless.

Is not this, by the way, the ultimate significance of the Old Testament incident of Uzzah and the ark? Those authorities who explain the story along the lines of the animistic doctrine of taboo may be literally correct. But its meaning for us surely is this: that to conceive that the Divine cause will totter to its fall unless we shore it up with adventitious supports is essentially God-dishonouring.

'Dr. Begg has told up,' said Professor Robertson Smith on an occasion which was one of the landmarks in the history of religious progress in the nineteenth century, his own trial for heresy some fifty years ago,

> 'that he is trembling for the ark of God. I know but one character in the Bible who trembled for the ark of God, and that was Eli . . . a worldly ecclesiastic, who trembled because for him it had ceased to be a shrine of the living, revealing word of God, and had become a fetish. As he trembled, he fell and perished. But the ark was safe, because it was the ark of God's revelation. No man need tremble for that.' [10]

'No man need tremble for that' — *there* is the only worthy and adequate attitude, the only attitude that bears the stamp of faith. The ark of the revelation of God is well able to look after itself. 'He had no fear of God's truth being overwhelmed,' says Stopford Brooke of Robertson of Brighton. 'To him Christianity could not be in danger.' [11] 'I have no fear of Atheism in this House,' said Gladstone during a celebrated debate in Parliament.

> 'Truth is the expression of the Divine mind, and however little our feeble vision may be able to discern the means by which God may provide for its preservation, we may leave the matter in His hands, and we may be sure that a firm and courageous application of every principle of equity and of justice is the best method we can adopt for the preservation and influence of truth.' [12]

The glorious words of Milton's *Areopagitica* express the same idea:

[10] Quoted from Crichton Miller, *The New Psychology and the Preacher*, p. 65. Cf. *Life of Wm. Robertson Smith*, by Black and Chrystal, p. 283.
[11] *Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson*, Intro. p. xix.
[12] Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, Book 8, Ch. 2.

> 'Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously, by licensing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?'

And a greater than Milton may be quoted to the same effect. St. Paul, in one of the least known but most significant of his sayings, suggests that all revolt against Truth is impotent. 'We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.'[13] The untrue thing proves its untruth by perishing; the truth vindicates itself by living. *Magna est veritas et prevalet.*

(4)

May it be that the spirit of 'irreligious solicitude for God' is to be traced to-day along a very different line from that of Fundamentalist bibliolatry?

> 'When science made it possible to fight smallpox epidemics,' says Prof. Joad, 'churchmen opposed the necessary sanitary measures as an attempt to escape merited punishment, and denounced vaccination as "an offence to God." When chloroform was invented, they opposed its use, especially in childbirth — had not God laid a primeval curse upon women?—and denounced it as "an offence to God."'
>
> And Prof. Joad proceeds: 'To-day they are denouncing birth control as "unnatural" and "an offence to God."'[14]

The subject is not an easy one, and the present writer does not profess to have reached finality on a much-debated matter. But may there not be more in Prof. Joad's parallel than, perhaps, some are inclined to think?

Mr. H. G. Wells, in *William Clissold*, makes birth control the 'test of orthodoxy between liberalism and reaction, the symbol of man's conscious control of his destiny.' 'I cannot conceive,' he says,

> 'a world republic existing and continuing unless that automatic increase of population which follows every increase in the food supply is restrained, and it can only be restrained by a world-wide knowledge and universal acceptability of the methods and means of birth control.'[15]

The final truth is not necessarily with William Clissold, nor even (softly be it said) with H. G. Wells, who in the words quoted is apparently himself speaking through the mouth of his not too attractive puppet. And some would say that Mr. Wells flagrantly begs the whole question when he says that the only restraint possible consists in 'the methods and means of birth

[13] *II Cor.* xiii, 8.
[14] *Op. cit.*, p. 151.
[15] *H. G. Wells, A Sketch for a Portrait,* by Geoffrey West, p. 240.

control.' It may even be argued that such 'methods and means' do not amount to 'restraint' at all. But, even so, the matter must not be closured as a certain type of theological mind closured vaccination and anaesthetics, by denouncing it out of hand as 'an offence to God.' The whole question should be calmly and intelligently considered, lest perchance we repeat the blunder and fall into the condemnation of the misguided opponents of the sanative measures of former days, the blunder and condemnation of those who denounced lightning-rods as 'an unwarrantable interference with God's use of lightning.'

(5)

In pleading for the opposite temper to 'irreligious solicitude for God' this paper is not an argument for a *laissez-faire* attitude in matters of faith and morals, and certainly its position is not that we are bound to accept every new scientific theory as necessarily true. 'The new Protestantism,' says the Dean of St. Paul's,

> 'is not relativist in the objects of its faith; it believes that truth is absolute, and that God is unchanging. But it accepts the necessity of growth and change in our beliefs. It holds that revelation is constant and progressive, and that all our knowledge has a bearing upon religion and morality.'

And therefore, as Dr. Inge adds, 'we must sit very loose to tradition, and keep our minds open.'[16]

Keeping our minds open does not mean waking every morning with the impression that everything is an open question—as it was wickedly suggested Arnold of Rugby did[17]—and to sit loose to tradition does not mean jettisoning the lessons of history. All that this paper seeks to do is to enter a caveat against that panicky antagonism to new ideas which is the bane of a certain type of religious mind, that faithless 'trembling for the ark of God' which has all too frequently marked the 'faithful' whenever any fresh departure in knowledge has been announced.

Samuel Rogers the poet, and Luttrell, another well-known Englishman of the time, were passing in a boat under old London Bridge about a hundred years ago, when its destruction was contemplated. 'Some very sensible men think,' said Rogers,

[16] *Assessments and Anticipations*, p. 84.
[17] See *Arnold of Rugby*, by Arnold Whitridge, p. 163.

'that if these works are carried into effect, the tide will flow so rapidly under the bridge that dangerous consequences will follow.' 'My dear Rogers,' answered Luttrell, 'if some very sensible men had been attended to, we should still be eating acorns.'[18] And if the fearful saints who have been apprehensive of 'dangerous consequences' had had their way, there would have been an end to progress in the realm of religious thought. If 'irreligious solicitude for God,' which has sought to veto practically every innovation, every progressive proposal, in the history of the ages, had carried the day, mankind would never have moved out of its primeval animism.

'I do not wish,' says Sir Wilfred Grenfell,

> 'to be numbered with the mob who persecuted Galileo, fought Pasteur, tried to kill Lord Lister, drove Morton into his grave, poohpoohed heavier-than-air aviation, ridiculed automobiles and even steam railways, sneered at Dr. Bell and his telephone dream as a lunatic, and refused to help the discoveries of radium and *X*-rays until those efforts took the form of dividend-paying shares on the stock market.'[19]

The only worthy attitude for the followers of Christ is that open-minded welcome to new ideas, that rejoicing in all new light from every quarter, that firm trust in the inherent power of truth, which is the opposite of 'irreligious solicitude for God.' 'For God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of a sound mind.'[20]

A. Garfield Curnow.

[18] G. W. E. Russell, *Collections and Recollections*, p. 23.
[19] *What Christ means to Me*, p. 121. [20] *II Tim.* i, 7.

BOOK REVIEWS

ESTLIN CARPENTER AND PHILIP WICKSTEED*

Professor Herford, of Manchester University, whose recent death has made Humanism in England much poorer, has left us as a legacy two biographies of men who were close friends in their activities and in their studies, and who represent a very new and very striking type of religion: I should almost venture to say of sainthood, though their saintliness has little likeness to the conventional type of the churches. Both were Unitarian ministers; both belonged to the group of men whom we associate with the *Manchester Guardian*; both were notable for great learning of a somewhat unusual type; but both must be regarded as active workers in the world rather than as recluse scholars. They have been fortunate in having as a biographer a man so eminent in literature and so kindred in character as Mr. Herford.

Dr. Carpenter was well known in Oxford as the head of Manchester College, an institution professedly undenominational but in practice Uni-

* *Joseph Estlin Carpenter.* Edited by C. H. Herford. 10/6. Oxford University Press, 1930.
* *Philip Henry Wicksteed: his life and work.* By C. H. Herford. 12/6. Dent, 1931.

tarian; he organised several summer schools of theology with the help of Continental colleagues; he took a great part in University Extension; he did more than anyone to achieve the success of the International Congress of the History of Religions; above all, he was the promoter of all movements tending to further high ideals in the city and peace in the world.

Dr. Wicksteed was in a somewhat different sphere quite as active. Indeed, both the biographies bear witness to a steadfast perseverance, an output of energy, a many-sidedness, which was marvellous. Carpenter excelled in the guidance of a corps of students, Wicksteed was an extension lecturer of perhaps unequalled brilliance and success. Both, though not athletes in the conventional sense, were devoted to outdoor exercises, rowing, walking and climbing. The one was an untiring horseman; the other, even at eighty, master of the bicycle. Both were centres of influence and unlimited in hospitality. Even in appearance they formed a contrast. Carpenter was tall and dignified, full of courtesy but rather cold in manner; Wicksteed, with his blue eyes and red hair and his fine physique, had in him much of the old Norse strain. The question of dignity would with him never arise; he was always doing something with almost superhuman energy; characteristically, he was never so happy as when boating on the fjiords of Norway, or passing the night in a peasant's house.

As I have written of Dr. Carpenter elsewhere,† I will now confine myself to the life of Dr. Wicksteed. It was characteristic of the latter that, though one of the most exuberant of men, he never aimed at originality. He took one master after another in the various fields in which he worked. He was a disciple of Jevons in Political Economy, a great admirer of Ibsen and of Wordsworth, a devoted follower of the great Dutch historian Kuenen. But, of course, his great work in life was as an exponent of Dante and, beyond Dante, of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas.

Some notion of the amazing extent and variety of his activities may be formed from the list of his books, articles and translations to be found at pp. 381-392 of the *Life*. The translations from Greek, Italian and Dutch might well be the work of a lifetime. From 1872 to 1923 he was a constant contributor to the *Inquirer*. But it was in personal teaching, exposition and discussion that he shone most brightly. In controversy he was overpowering. He more than held his own in a controversy with Mr. Bernard Shaw. Sometimes it must be confessed that he used his powers mercilessly; when he detected inconsistency, stupidity and, above all, hypocrisy, he came down, as the saying is, 'like a load of bricks.' But still more conspicuous was his power of sympathizing with those with whom he did not agree, if he was convinced of their sincerity.

To his abounding vitality and animal spirits the life bears ample testimony. One rather striking example recurs to me. On the last morning of his life from his bed he greeted the rising sun with a loud hurrah!

In spite of his overpowering personality, he was extremely modest, and cared nothing for fame; and he was so immersed in his lecturing and literary work that he hardly looked beyond it. Such men are seldom selected for academic honours. The Universities of Manchester and Leeds conferred on him honorary doctorates. But neither the old English Universities nor those of Scotland recognised his merit, and he was hardly conscious of the fact.

In the present place, it is more suitable to speak of Wicksteed's religious views. It is a subject extremely difficult to fathom. A Unitarian minister who gave most of his life to bringing the works of Dante within the reach of

† *Hibbert Journal*, xxvii, pp. 676—683.

many thousands in England, and who spent unnumbered days in the study of the vast system of Thomas Aquinas; a political economist who followed the school of Jevons, and yet was carried away by the rousing expositions of Henry George; a Socialist who was deeply affected by Comte yet reserved the highest place in his admiration for Wordsworth, Wicksteed may well seem to a reader a mass of incongruities. Mr. Herford heads a chapter 'Inner Synthesis'; but it is a very difficult chapter, one that I very imperfectly understand and shall not attempt to expound.

What one cannot doubt is that in Wicksteed extreme intellectual keenness was balanced by most affectionate impulses. With him to understand was to appreciate, and appreciation led to so intimate relations with the mind he was studying that he became in a measure the votary of all the great authors whom he read, and whom he expounded with extreme perspicacity.

Most of us, when we read a really fine novel, can for an hour identify ourselves with the hero. And most of us, when we read a convincing argument, become for an hour converts. This faculty of imaginative sympathy Wicksteed must have had in a remarkable degree, and he was extraordinarily free from holding any kind of dogma. 'I am not sure,' he said, 'whether the religion of the future will be strongly Theistic. But it will have to embrace things that only Theism has hitherto reached.' It is easy to understand that he attained a much higher level as an expositor than as a preacher.

The group of men to which Carpenter and Wicksteed and Herford belonged, the Coryphaeus of which was the great Martineau, have undoubtedly contributed largely to the religion of England, which is made up of many strands. It is an element of which S. James would have approved, consisting rather in action than in thought, not at all other-worldly, but of a fine mundane type. P. GARDNER.

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM*

An *embarras de richesse* confronts every attempt to draw the personality of the late Archbishop of Upsala. The memories are so vivid, the sifting of the historical material which comes with the distance in time has not yet taken place. There is, however, in his own country a general feeling that the recollections should be taken down now, and fully, to let his memory stand out clearly, imperative, inspiring an ideal for Church and individuals. For this reason several books on his life and work have been published in Sweden during the last few months, and have been subject to great public demand.

Of these the largest is *Nathan Söderblom: In Memoriam.* It is also the hardest to read, because of the accumulation of material. From different aspects some of the closest friends and coadjutors of the late Archbishop have given a thorough exposition of the principal sides of his activities as a comparative religionist, as a theologian, as a practical churchman. We see him moving about his large diocese, as leader of the whole Swedish Church in internal questions as well as in international work in foreign missions and, before all, in the 'oecumenical' movement, the child of his heart. To the history of the man is united the history of an epoch in the life of the Church of Sweden. Names like Aulén, Andrae, Björkquist, Brilioth, Dahlquist, Liedgren warrant wideness of outlook and knowledge of facts.

* *Nathan Söderblom: In Memoriam.* By Andrae, Aulén, Björkquist, Brilioth, Liedgren, etc. (Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelse, Stockholm, 1931. Price, Swed. Crowns, 9.75; cloth bound, Swed. Crowns, 11.50.)

Three clergymen were nominated for a certain parish, and somebody asked the bishop whom to choose. The bishop praised highly the merits of two of the candidates. About the third he said : ' If you want one who can show you the way to Heaven, take him.' That was the father of Nathan Söderblom.

The heritage from the home of his youth was an unusual sensitiveness as to what living religion means. This helped the student of comparative religion to appreciate it, even in forms strange to the average man. Thus he was able to understand primitive man's sense of ' the numinous ' as well as popular piety in a country parish or even in sectarian movements.

The simple piety of the country parsonage had an open window towards the world in the interest in foreign missions. It might have been this interest that turned the attention of the young student to the study of foreign religions. In this field he soon became a prominent scholar.

Characteristic of his scientific work on these lines is his freedom from schematism, and his constant realisation of the abundant richness of reality and life. About the time when he took up his studies, the comparative method was largely used to find *propter* for *post*. Wherever a similar occurrence was found, it was generally taken to prove borrowing. We remember the stir of the *Babel-Bible* discussions. Söderblom opposed energetically the excesses of the method, convinced as he was that quite independently life may produce parallel results under parallel circumstances. The evident similarities between the Persian and the Jewish eschatologies induced him to investigate and bring out the inherent differences, as each of the two tries to solve the common problems according to its own character.

His contributions within the field of Comparative Religion are manifold. The main principle underlying his work is that religion must be considered within its own sphere. The analysis of the world of religion cannot be undertaken from the points of view either of culture or even of ethics. Religion is an independent unit which does not at all follow the changes of civilisation. The central idea in religion is the Holy. The content of Holiness may differ ; its characteristic is the attitude of reverence to something Divine. The qualifications necessary for the student of religion are piety and scientific sincerity. Söderblom was convinced that, the deeper the understanding of other religions, the more the specific character of the Christian religion would become evident. The more generously, unreservedly and sincerely we acknowledge what is good, noble and true in foreign religions, and the more we endeavour to understand and to present, without partiality, their real beliefs, the more it will appear how incomparable Christianity is.

The influence of Ritschl can be seen particularly in the earlier period. In two directions it became really important. It widened the idea of revelation from the book-bound conceptions of the old orthodoxy into a living history of God's activity. And it turned his attention to Martin Luther. Along both these lines some of Söderblom's most important contributions to theology are to be found. He soon outgrew his masters, but to Ritschl is due a new inspiration.

There was a kind of personal relationship that drew Söderblom to Luther. To a certain extent it was a heritage from the parental home and the atmosphere there, but more than that it was a personal accent. The duality so ably expressed in the name of his great studies in the life of the master, humour and melancholy, had a certain resonance in his own soul. Faith was to both not a gift of a sunny nature, as it might seem to us, but a laboriously conquered treasure of the soul.

It may be just for this reason that he became a comforter of the soul,

as we have had but few in Sweden. There was a kind of sunshine about him —an aureole, one might be tempted to say—physically in his golden-coloured often disorderly lion's mane, spiritually in the way in which he touched things. When visiting the parishes, somebody said it was characteristic that he congratulated either the parish or the priest. A critic introduces the third alternative: that, if possible, he congratulated both! His *epistola pastoralis,* when he was consecrated Archbishop, gives as the motto: 'Not that we have lordship over your faith, but are helpers of your joy' (*II Cor.* i, 24). He lived up to his ideal, and he took every opportunity to be a 'helper of joy.' From all quarters people are testifying, now when he is gone, that he never failed to encourage people by word and deed.

Still, nothing was farther from him than a cheap optimism. Few men in Europe may have suffered more intensely than he did in his spirit from the world war. In youth he had been rector of the Swedish Church in Paris, he had taken his degree at the Sorbonne and entered into close touch with French Protestantism. Here in England he had been on several lecturing trips and gained many personal friends. The English Church had made a strong impression on his soul by her spirit of worship and her eagerness to serve. The last two years before the war he had been Professor of Comparative Religion at Leipzig, and during that time he had thoroughly gained the confidence of the German Lutherans. His heart was deeply concerned with all parties. To him neutrality did not mean a cold, self-satisfied looking-on, but an intense sympathy, a partaking in the sufferings of all those involved. It drove him to a deeper penetration into the mystery of the Cross. His greatest contribution to the devotional books of the Swedish Church is his study in the passion of our Lord.

His theology had been Christo-centric from the beginning. His studies in comparative religion gave a vivid and realistic relief to the revelation in Christ. More and more he was drawn towards the centrally and classically Christian ideas. The main tendency in his interpretation of revelation is to put forth the God of the Christian faith as the living, always active God. He defines the 'saints' as those who in their lives, ways and doings show, clearly and unambiguously, that God is living.

The Church is the expression of God's continuous activity in the human world. In the Swedish Christian Student Movement a new interest in the church, its life and problems arose about 1908. The national church became an object of considerable enthusiasm. Söderblom stood in the centre of the new movement as one of the leaders, always keeping a wider outlook. He was a little afraid of too nationalistic and particularistic an interpretation of the religious heritage. He did not even like to speak of 'the Church of Sweden'; he preferred 'the Church in Sweden.'

The universal outlook was there from an early time. Perhaps he experienced the 'oecumenical revival' already in 1890 as a young delegate to the student meeting at Northfield in U.S.A. His diary from those days contains the prayer: 'Lord, give me the humility and wisdom to serve the great cause of the free unity of Thy church.' More and more his international connections had strengthened and made him fit for service. The years in Paris had given him the 'European mind.' As a preparatory task he tried to stimulate the interests of the theological students in the study of other languages than German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew. At the time, the German influence on Swedish theology had practically a monopoly. Once there was a discussion in the theological association in Upsala on Swedish theology: the non-existence of such a thing was deplored, while there was a dissatisfaction with modern German theology. Söderblom sums up the

discussion somewhat ironically: 'But, gentlemen, what should then our theological students read? Swedish theology, we have just been told, isn't there. German theology, well, that is so rationalistic and critical and abstract and dry, that one ought not to read it. French theology — well I never—the French are so frivolous and superficial. And English theology, that is also impossible: as everybody knows, our theologians are not able to read English.' Fortunately, things have changed, and to a not inconsiderate degree through his own activities.

In the motto, 'Life and Work,' is expressed his endeavour to unite Sectarian Christendom into an active communion of Christian brotherhood. Sometimes his intentions were misunderstood. Not that the communion of faith was secondary, neither was there any kind of syncretism or religious relativism at the back of his mind. He says himself: 'There are two ways to universalism, one by trying to gather the valuable from all quarters, the other by trying to grasp and pursue the essential, rather than to embrace the various. To my mind the latter is the safer way. To evangelical catholicity the unity is found in the communion of faith. The nearer to Christ, the nearer to one another his disciples will be.'

As so often, so in Söderblom, we see how the personality serves best as the instrument of an idea. His personal charm, his kindliness, his openness to people of all kinds and ranks and interests, his eagerness to understand other people's points of view, his mastering of languages, the cascade of ideas and new turns, his whole spiritual outfit, made him singularly fitted to be a God's go-between. A saint should be rather human, at least in these times. He was. Rightly he could quote: *Nihil humanum a me alienum.* Deeply musical, with a clear sonorous voice completely controlled, he held people spellbound. A freshness of thought and originality of combination gave new aspects to old themes. To meet him was to meet an intensely living soul. None in his own country had a power like his to reach the secularized educated classes. If, during the last decades, the Swedish Church has regained some influence here, where she had lost immensely during the latter part of the nineteenth century, it is largely through his venture.

A short review like this cannot give a full account of his place within the 'oecumenical' movement, so ably described by Dr. Brilioth in the book under consideration. That is the aspect under which he is mostly seen outside his own country. Through many vicissitudes, misunderstandings and oppositions a beginning has been made. The Stockholm Conference, 1925, was a victory of faith. And within his own church the new consciousness of international obligation has been awakened through his efforts.

The stimulating influence of Nathan Söderblom reaches through many sides of the national life and even outside his own country. In all the manifoldness there is a surprising consistency—the influence of a man showing, through his life and ways, that God is living.

Swedish Rectory, London. F. Holmgren.

THE MYTH OF OSIRIS.

The author of a new work on Osiris quotes Andrew Lang as saying that to narrate and as far as possible elucidate the myth of Osiris 'is the chief task of Egyptian mythology.'* The truth of this statement may be said to have been emphasised more and more in recent years, for it is remarkable to what an extent inquirers have concentrated on the story of Osiris and on

* *Osiris. A Study on Myths, Mysteries and Religion.* By Harold P. Cooke, M.A. (C. W. Daniel & Co., 1931. 5/- net.)

the rites and ceremonies centring round him. At the same time, the field of inquiry has widened since the days of Andrew Lang. We know more about Egyptian mythology and religion, and for comparison what we know about Babylonian mythology and religion can hardly be mentioned in the same breath with what was known in 1887, when *Myth, Ritual and Religion* was first published. Moreover, in the interval another truth, as it seems to many, has emerged more clearly: that to discover the key to the myth of Osiris is to discover the key to much of the magic and religion of the ancient world. Isis and Osiris, Horus and Set stand for ideas which reached far beyond Egypt.

The myth of Osiris is approached in different ways by the school represented by Sir J. G. Frazer, by the school represented by W. Schmidt, and by the school represented by Elliot Smith, W. J. Perry and A. M. Hocart. Mr. H. P. Cooke does not profess adherence to any of these schools, and there is nothing to indicate that he has paid special attention to the second and third of them. In some ways his book is all the more interesting on that account. It is refreshing to find an inquirer studying his subject independently. He could not, of course, ignore the vast collection of material provided by Frazer; but even in his case, while expressing great respect for 'his vast erudition,' he ventures to differ from his views very widely.

Mr. Cooke is convinced 'that no treatment of the myth of Osiris (not to mention here similar legends) can ever prove really successful, unless it takes into account, first of all, certain facts of astronomy known to those ancient Egyptians and, secondly, the fact that the god had not only his myth but his mysteries.' These are the points he wishes to stress. The elucidation of the first point is interesting, and those who are not convinced will at least think it plausible. Of more general interest is the elucidation of the second point, for it leads the reader into attractive fields beyond Egypt. The mysteries of Osiris are brought into close relationship with other mysteries, such as those of Dionysus and those celebrated at Eleusis.

A whole chapter of the book is devoted to Joseph and Moses. Mr. Cooke thinks that Joseph was clearly initiated into the Egyptian mysteries. That this was so may be inferred from the position that he occupied in Egypt. It seems to be indicated also by his change of name. According to Josephus, the new name signified 'Discoverer of Secrets,' and this will hardly have had reference solely to his interpretation of dreams. Moses was brought up as an Egyptian and, according to the *Acts of the Apostles* (vii, 22), he 'was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.' According to Manetho, he bore an Egyptian name and was a priest. Josephus relates that he commanded an army, and defeated the Ethiopians. In any case, it can hardly be doubted that Moses did acquire 'wisdom' in Egypt, nor can it be supposed that when he left the country he left this 'wisdom' behind him. We may add that, as a result of that great religious experience which a writer in the Old Testament attempts to describe, Moses must have come to see things in a new light. This will explain his emergence as one of the world's greatest pioneers and prophets. What has been said does not exhaust the interest of Mr. Cooke's book. The book merits careful study.

Manchester University. MAURICE A. CANNEY.

CIVILIZATION AS DIVINE SUPERMAN.*

Mr. Raven in his preface describes this book as an attempt to build up a systematic philosophy of history. The Great War and the intermittent

* *Civilization as Divine Superman.* By Alexander Raven. (Williams & Norgate, Ltd., 1932. Price 12/6.)

world crisis which has prevailed ever since have quickened our interest in World History; the remarkable vogue of Spengler's recondite and obscure work, and of Mr. Well's *Outline*, testifies to this. The ordinary educated man, perhaps even more than the scholar, is not satisfied with a mere record of facts; he asks for a scheme of human development similar to that which Darwen and his followers have constructed for the evolution of physical life. The evolutionary historian like Mr. Wells endeavours, as Mr. Raven says, to make the dogma of upward progress apply not only to biology, to the advance of primitive man from the ape, but to world history since the advent of civilization. Humanity is moving, slowly, painfully, and with occasional set-backs, from man to superman. Instead of the ancestor worship of primitive man, our modern prophets offer us the beatific vision of our descendants, 'Men like Gods,' Methuselahs, if not positively immortals, and in the contemplation of their future blessedness we are to find a substitute for a lost faith in personal immortality.

Mr. Raven will have none of these dreams.

> 'It cannot be too strongly emphasized that history and biology are two distinct subjects, and that the discovery of evolution as the basic principle of the latter has no real bearing upon a discussion of the former.'

He appeals to history against the dogma of progress. He points to the stately Pyramids, relics from the grey dawn of civilization; to the legal code of Hammurabi of Babylon, four thousand years old; to the cultural glory of ancient Greece; and, on the other hand, to the long-drawn horror of ignorance and barbarism during the Dark Ages that followed the destruction of ancient civilization. The change from biology to history did not come, according to Mr. Raven, when man emerged from apehood; it came at the dawn of civilization. The Superman is not a hypothetical being ready to be revealed in the last time, and visible at present only to the eye of faith, but a superorganism, a civilization or culture, in the body of which individual men are but tiny cells.

Manifestly the Superman of Mr. Raven has a certain affinity to the Great Leviathan of Hobbes, 'which is but an artificial man, though of greater stature and strength than the natural.' An early edition of the 'Leviathan' was adorned by a plate representing a crowned giant made up of tiny figures of human beings and bearing sword and crozier in the two hands. We are all familiar with the conception of the State as an organism.

Mr. Raven's Superman, however, is not the State but a civilization. During the first and last phase of the history of every civilization it is ruled autocratically, as Mediaeval Europe was ruled by the Popes. Later it breaks up into national States, as did Europe at the Reformation. Then comes, as the hand of time moves on inexorably, democracy with its material prosperity for the individual and steady decay of cultural ideals. Lastly follow plutocracy and collapse into the primaeval anarchy, the chaos from which civilizations are born and to which in due time they return.

For the super-organisms are not immortal; they are susceptible to growth and decay like the individual human being. They are endowed with the faculty of reproducing their kind, and may give birth to descendant civilizations. Thus the ancient Mediterranean civilizations gave birth to that of Modern Europe, which in its turn has produced that of America and Australasia. In these cases, we are told, the life-course of the descendant will be strictly parallel to that of the parent civilization. We are reminded of a passage in Gibbon where, after stating that in the fourth century a tribe of cannibals lived in the neighbourhood of Glasgow, he

adds that this fact encourages the pleasing hope that New Zealand may produce in some future age the Hume of the Southern Hemisphere.

The main thesis of the book is supported by illustrations drawn from the history of the most varied cultures, from China to Peru, and there is much in these to interest those who may disagree with the author's conclusions. Different chapters deal with the inevitable cycles — political, economic, social, religious—through which all civilizations pass. Each culture has its appropriate religion and morality which is valid for those beneath its sway :

> 'Each cultural community is true to its own religion and its own godhead, and the proselytizing zeal of the missionaries is rightly to be condemned as turning the native from his own true faith to the strange god of the foreigner.'
>
> 'The Superman has a paramount claim upon our services, for it is only through Him that we can attain to the highest expression of our possibilities.'

It almost seems as if Mr. Raven advocates a return to polytheism, or at any rate to henotheism, the worship of cultural if not tribal gods.

It is difficult within the limits of a review to criticise adequately a book which contains much that is stimulating and suggestive, shrewd and even profound. We venture to submit two questions :

1. Does not the cyclic theory of the rise and fall of cultures involve fatalism with its numbing consequences?
2. Does not philosophy demand a belief in certain absolute values in religion, morality, art, which are valid for all time and everywhere?

Mr. Raven himself seems sometimes to feel this, for he implies in one passage that true religion involves a feeling of universal brotherhood in God and a higher destiny behind human affairs. St. Paul, while not denying the existence of cultural deities, says : 'Though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, to us there is but one God, the Father, of Whom are all things, and we in Him.'

GAMALIEL MILNER.

ISRAEL'S REDEMPTION STORY TOLD IN CANTICLES.*

The Canticles of Israel in the Story of Redemption is a collection of canticles taken from the Book of Common Prayer and set to music. Each canticle is very briefly annotated in the Preface; *e.g.* the *Venite* is summarized as 'The Canticle of a Racial Revelation. Israel becomes the Chosen People of Jehovah, the nation from whom the Divine Redeemer was to arise.' The description of the *Te Deum* as 'The Canticle of Redemption's Climatic Future' reminds us of Fowler's comment on this unusual word in *Modern English Usage* : 'Climatic is falsely formed from climax, and it may fairly be demanded of the literary critics, who alone have occasion for the adjective, that they should MEND or END it.'

In a Prefatorial Note, Dr. Mountain writes : 'The aim and object has been to endeavour to interpret and emphasize their spiritual signification and beauty, and to shew forth their connection with the glorious Redeeming work of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

Whether the music emphasizes the spiritual significance and beauty is really very doubtful. The settings are distinctly conventional. We look in

* *The Canticles of Israel in the Story of Redemption.* By Rev. J. Mountain, D.D. (Covenant Publishing Company, 1931. 2/6.)

vain for any individuality or novelty in musical treatment. Much of the music sounds like a collection of older melodies rather carelessly put together.

It is, moreover, a serious question whether new settings to well-known canticles should be desired. The composer suggests that 'the Canticles of Israel might be used with much blessing not only in the usual Sunday services but also in their entirety as an Evening Service of Sacred Song. Where this is thought to be desirable a special choir should be formed.' But choirs were brought into existence to help congregations to sing the Divine praise. They must *not* steal part of the people's due.

The frequent changes in tempo and expression (witness, for example, the directions: joyfully, rather quicker, with feeling, quicker, with feeling, all of which occur in the *Venite*), together with the abnormal range and intervals of some of the canticles, as well as frequent changes of key within the same canticle, make the work difficult, if not impossible, for congregational singing.

In parish churches, it is better for choirs to devote themselves to occasional anthems rather than to elaborate settings of canticles which can only be wearisome to the congregation and tend rather to lessen than to promote church-worship.

B.H.C.W.

AN IDEAL PARSON.*

No doubt there are occasions when 'to see ourselves as others see us' is merely irritating: their point of view is so aloof and undiscerning that it is better ignored. But this is in no sense true of the Archdeacon of Northumberland. He has had 'the good fortune of a varied experience,' so that, when he criticises, he speaks from within; he only steps out of the ranks, as it were, to offer a better position for others to come into line with him. Of his book, 'A Parson's Job,' he writes that it is intended to give laymen a truer idea of the parson's work; but it is such a wide and discriminating review of the problems and tasks with which a parson is—or ought to be—concerned, that it will be to the advantage of every ordained minister to find time to study it. And if it be added to the list of books to be read by an ordination candidate, it will serve several purposes—not least of which will be to leaven his preparation with a sense of humour!

It is a book full of practical advice by one who is at once a keen observer and an impartial critic. Archdeacon Hunter has a 'Catholic' appreciation of order and beauty in worship, and consequently he has a good deal to say about the use and value of the Eucharist. He also pleads for a greater measure of unity in the ceremonial of the Liturgy. We might have demurred here, but, instead, we are glad to notice that he does not interpret this either in terms of a rigid uniformity or along the lines of worshipping the idol of 'liturgical purity' (*cf.* p. 231). One unfortunate effect of the otherwise praiseworthy revival of interest in the beauty of worship is that we are in danger of being overwhelmed by a new liturgical scholasticism. Because a thing 'always used to be so' is not necessarily a good argument for reviving it: and we confess that some of the details stressed by modern students of liturgiology seem to us to suggest worshipping God with a certain vacancy of mind.

With regard to the subject of preaching and teaching, the author has some very outspoken things to say. An American recently asked: 'What has taken the *pull* out of the pulpit?' Archdeacon Hunter would reply that 'There is far too much spiritual trifling in the pulpit. . . The desire, in-

**A Parson's Job.* By Archdeacon Leslie S. Hunter. (S.C.M., 1931, pp. 256. Price 7/6.)

articulate, it may be, of the pew is that the man in the pulpit should deal with the big subjects and deal with them honestly and courageously' (p. 95). Therefore, he pleads for more definite moral teaching and leadership, at once more sympathetic and more in touch with practical experience. 'The modern man,' he says, 'by no means indisposed to religion, as he lies ditched and bogged in moral questionings, sees priest and levite hurrying by on the other side, one to say mass, the other to preside at a smoking concert. It is a Samaritan in the form of a Shaw or a Huxley who administers first aid and sets him on his ass.'

There ripples through the pages a wealth of humour always enlivening, usually unexpected and only once cynical (p. 18!). We cite two examples:

'Every incumbent who refuses to preach more than one sermon a Sunday in his church should, by vote of the House of Laity, be given a bonus on his pension.'

'Those who devise a baptismal service should themselves submit it to the test of a dozen babies in full hue and cry. . .'

It is inevitable that in a book which deals courageously with so wide a sphere of Church politics, there should be some points on which one may be disposed to criticize the writer. Archdeacon Hunter's parson is an Ideal Parson, for in the course of one page (146) he is expected to 'make his Church council an efficient partner'; 'share his moral common sense with the laity'; and 'educate the electorate . . . so that it will elect the right people.' (Bother these stubborn little cliques!) But, no doubt, the Archdeacon will reply in the words of Burns:

'A man's reach must exceed his grasp
Or what's a heaven for?'

J.P.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

RESUSCITATION OF THE BODY AND ITS DENIAL.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

The Rev. Charles Tweedale's letter on page 579 of your current issue seems to imply that I have expressed myself casually about an Article of Christian faith. I will only say that the word I used about an ordinary body laid in a tomb was 'resuscitation,' not 'resurrection,' and that I made no casual remark at all about the Body of Christ. Anything that I have to say seriously on the latter topic is said near the end of my article in the current issue of the *Hibbert Journal.* The word 'resurrection' is ambiguous, and may be taken as a technical term about which an immense amount has been written. It may be interpreted in various ways, and is best avoided by a layman.

OLIVER LODGE.

January 23rd, 1932.

SCHEME FOR REFORM OF THE HOUSE OF LAITY.

SIR,

As a Member of Parliament your scheme fills me with dismay. All Members, who claim to be Churchmen, are to have the right to sit in the Church Assembly. Before a General Election, therefore, every candidate will have to make known his attitude to the ecclesiastical questions of the day, will have to include such views in his speeches, election address and pamphlets,

and submit to be heckled on them by Low Churchmen, Anglo-Catholics, Modernists, and not less by Roman Catholics, Non-conformists and by every sort of crank. Still more, the political parties and leaders will then have to pronounce on the subject, and their machines will have to work for the agreed views. What would the result be? Stagnation, without a doubt. The easiest policy would be a no-change policy, and nine candidates out of ten would willingly pledge themselves accordingly. In effect, few would ever attend the Church Assembly, except the extremists who, being burdened with Parliamentary affairs, would rush into the Assembly for a Division, vote without hearing or considering the arguments, and back to the House. If an important issue arose, a whip would go round the House of Commons, which would flood the Assembly, overpower it and troop back to the House.

No, sir. The Assembly, like Parliament, must get on with the best men it can find to undertake its duties, and with a house of laymen representing those who most take trouble parochially to advance the work of the Church. Your criticism of them would apply equally to Members of Parliament. We certainly do not represent, as in a looking-glass, our political brethren. Apply your own phrases to us; we are too parliamentary, too politically-minded, much too idealist, much too subservient to our leaders and party-whips, to 'represent' the electorate. We 'most plainly bear very little likeness to what our laity are.' But such is politics, and such must be any effective machine for democratic Church-government, if the Church, unlike Rome and Moscow, refuses to accept any authority imposed on it.

I fear I cannot sympathise with your, as it seems to me, excessive regard for the right of 'three-fourths of the population,'—ignorant, alas, of the great mission of Our Lord and of the Church; aloof, for whatever reason, from its activities, its spirit, its machinery and personnel—to overrule those who, with the best light vouchsafed to them, are trying to improve the machine and extend and intensify its usefulness. Reform must come from within, based on the painful toil of education of the parishioners, especially by education of the future clergy, safeguarded by the sovereign power of Parliament.

F. E. FREMANTLE.

Bedwell Park, Herts.
January 28th, 1932.

SIR,

CANINE RELIGION.

The theory of Professor Rudolph Otto that the basis of religion is a kind of fear, awe, or reverence, the ease of which is a feeling of 'creature-liness,' inclusive of Schliermacher's 'feeling of absolute dependence,' is, I think, beautifully expressd, in spirit though not in intention, in the first stanza of Rudyard Kipling's delightful poem *Supplication of a Black Aberdeen,* which I venture to quote:—

I pray! My little body and whole span
Of years is Thine, my Owner and my Man.
For Thou hast made me—unto Thee I owe
This dim, distressed half-soul that hurts me so,
Compact of every crime, but, none the less,
Broken by knowledge of its naughtiness.
Put me not from Thy Life—'tis all I know.
If Thou forsake me, whither shall I go?

Doubtless to a dog his Master is '*Mysterium tremedum et fascinans*!'

G.A.B.